The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Volume III | New York, Saturday, July 31, 1915 | Number 39

Contents

Editorial Notes 319

Leading Editorials .....
- The Next Step 322
- American Finance Finds Itself 323
- The Eastland 325

General Articles .....
- A New Kind of War ..... Norman Angell 327
- Arithmetic of the Armies ..... Gerald Morgan 329
- The Unbroken Chain. Part I ..... Romain Rolland. Translated by Lee Simonson 330
- Natural Leadership ..... George Santayana 333

A Communication .....
- The Case for England's Blockade ..... W. D. S. 334

Correspondence 335

Drama: Musical Comedy Evolves ..... Francis Hackett 336

Books and Things 337

Reviews of Books .....
- The New Philosopher's Stone ..... Morris R. Cohen 338
- The Big Battalions 339
- A Doctor on Birth Control ..... Felix Grendon 340

IF any evidence is required to show how little war fever there is in this country, the sinking of the Leelanaw will supply it. Were we looking for trouble the incident could easily be magnified. But we are not looking for trouble, and practically the whole so-called anti-German press has been at the greatest pains to show that the wrong is merely a technical one. In an age when it is customary to denounce the press, it is fine to notice the calm and intelligence with which the newspapers prevented the affair from adding fuel to the fire. Were American newspapers jingo, the Leelanaw was their opportunity. Their restraint is significant also for a greater reason. It emphasizes the sincerity of the American attitude. If Germany had not destroyed life wantonly, we should willingly have argued with her and made no threats. The Leelanaw case is one in which there is genuine room for difference of opinion; and Americans even in their present temper are glad to recognize the difference. The event proves also that we are not protesting against the use of submarines, nor trying to deprive Germany of what she calls her most "effective" weapon; we are asking her to do in the case of all ships what she did in the case of the Anglo-Californian and the Leelanaw. We are asking her to stop them and search them and save the lives of crew and passengers. We may dispute her right to destroy an American ship, but we should never raise that dispute into a cause for war.

THE Eastland disaster points with dreadful certainty to a grave defect in the system by which we attempt to secure safety at sea and on the Great Lakes. In the past we have learnt prudence only by the chance light of disasters on particular sources of danger. It was the Titanic that showed the need of adequate lifeboat equipment. It was the wreck of the Volturno which proved that in a storm even good equipment was useless without a competent crew. The lesson of the Eastland, pressed home with all the tragic appeal of its hundreds dead, is no less plain. It is a warning that every ship in which imperative principles of marine construction are violated threatens suffering and loss of life which adequate lifeboat equipment and competent crew can at best only mitigate. It is sad that we should need so appalling a horror to teach this simple lesson, long understood and often pointed out by marine experts. It would be a lasting disgrace if we paid the price without learning the lesson.

WHILE the men who built and the company which operated the Eastland cannot escape the largest share of responsibility for the accident, it is to the federal inspection service that one turns most naturally for a remedy. Whether the general charges of incompetency that have long been directed against some of the local inspectors are justified, and whether the serious specific charges of venality on the part of the official who inspected the Eastland are true, the investigations now in progress will determine. The problem, however, lies deeper. An inspector who is paid a salary of $1,800 a year may be competent to count the lifeboats and rafts, and determine their capacity, and measure

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the dimensions of the crew's quarters. But problems of marine architecture cannot be solved by rule of thumb, hence local inspectors will not generally set up their own views as to a vessel's seaworthiness against the shipbuilder's experts. In England the Board of Trade has always at its service a marine expert of international reputation, and it frequently calls on skilled naval architects for special assistance. As a consequence, inspection of marine construction is not in England the mere matter of form which it has become very generally in the United States. Until we are willing to employ experts at expert's wages we cannot be certain that such senseless tragedies as the capsizing of the Eastland will not recur.

INDUSTRIES, like individuals, must grow up according to their environment. We cannot make railways compete if it pays them to combine, and we cannot conduct an industry on anarchical lines if order is profitable or necessary. This fact has again been proved in the cloak, suit and skirt industry of New York City. There the protocol, a trade agreement between the manufacturers and employees, after having been abrogated is quietly reëstablished, because the underlying conditions in the industry make the existence of a strong manufacturers' association and a strong trade union desirable. It is true that the protocol is restored under a different name and with certain changes. The new agreement is to last two years, while the old one was terminable at notice. But in all essential respects the earlier conditions are reëstablished. The new agreement provides for collective bargaining, for a simple but effective machinery for dealing with grievances, for a joint sanitary control of the shops, and for a continued application of those principles and rules which gave this industry a measure of constitutionalism during the continuance of the former protocol. Unless at the last moment something prevents the carrying out of the present plan, the protocol which has just come to an end will be succeeded by itself.

IN bringing about this result full credit should be given to the extraordinarily able men on the Council of Conciliation appointed by Mayor Mitchel. But for their ingenuity, tact and statesmanship it might have been difficult to bring together two groups so mutually aggrieved as were the manufacturers and the men. Yet intelligent as is this Council of Conciliation, it could not solve problems that are essentially unsolvable Most quarrels in the industry arose over the employers' right to discharge, and the employees' right not to be discharged unfairly, and each side desired a formulation of its rights and duties which would automatically protect it in all cases. But no such formulation was or ever will be possible. The rule is reestablished that the employers' right to discharge shall not be exercised unjustly, oppressively, or with intent to injure the union; but what constitutes oppression, what is fairness and reasonableness, remain, as before, matters for decision in individual cases. Inevitably there will be new disagreements and new arbitral awards which will satisfy no one. But this is better than no decision at all. Men may chafe under constitutional government, but in the end they prefer it to anarchy.

IN one respect the conditions under the new agreement are different from those under the old protocol. Wages have been raised. Not only have piece rates been increased, but an addition of 10 per cent has been made to the wages of week workers. There is justification for this increase. Though the weekly rates paid to-day are not in themselves abnormally low, the average employee in this highly seasoned trade has so few weeks of employment that his annual earnings fall below a reasonable remuneration. Admittedly it would be better for the workers' earnings to be increased through greater steadiness of employment rather than through a flat increase. But greater steadiness of employment can be secured only through a gradual evolution of the industry involving many slow and difficult adjustments, and in the meantime the workers must live.

NO greater contrast could exist than between the attitude of the employers in the cloak, suit and skirt industry in New York and that of the Standard Oil Company at Bayonne. In Bayonne we have had again all the usual pleasant accompaniments of a malevolent industrial feudalism—a refusal to meet labor representatives, a denial of mediation or arbitration, the employment of thugs, the resort to murder, violence, and the rest. We have had also a new lesson in the art of "maintaining order," given by a strike-breaking, strike-leading, pistol-fingering, two-fisted sheriff, who impartially arrests strike guards and city officials, orders peaceful citizens to their homes, and splurges over the front pages of the newspapers. The strike ends with a promised increase in wages (which the company assures us was "under consideration" before the trouble), and with the return of the strikers, personally conducted by the sheriff. There is a touch of tragedy as well as of opera bouffe about it all. One asks inevitably, "Have the Rockefellers learned nothing?" One might have expected, after all the criticism to which this financial group has been subjected, that some faint glimmer of a perception of the value of industrial democracy might

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

have entered their minds. But in Bayonne we meet the same stubborn attitude which we have met in Colorado and elsewhere. The world does not move. The Rockefellers learn nothing and forget nothing.

AN uncommonly speedy decision has been rendered by the arbitrators of the Chicago street-car strike. It is a decision substantially in favor of the men. Wages are increased roughly about 13 per cent, and the period which must elapse before a man reaches maximum wages has been shortened from five years to four. The representative of the employers has taken strong exception to this award, and his minority report is just as much an expression of the disappointment of the companies as the minority report in the arbitration of three years ago was an expression of the disappointment of the employees. No one can pretend, however, that the present dissenting opinion has any of the color of tragedy. A pall may be cast over the spirit of Mr. Sheean, the able traction advocate, and the employers' conviction may be strengthened that wages are a gross encumbrance on even their prosperous concerns. But the increase is far from inordinate. Judging by the testimony, it does little more than keep step with the cost of living. This is probably what decided the arbitrators, and it is admirable that the companies "wish it distinctly understood that the award will be accepted and faithfully carried out."

AMERICANS should have no difficulty in understanding Mr. Henry James's conversion to British citizenship. We ourselves are in large part composed of people who have abandoned the citizenship into which they were born. They become naturalized here because they live here and work here and throw in their lot with us. Mr. James has reversed the process. He is perhaps our greatest emigrant, and it is altogether natural that he should take up political citizenship in the country where the better part of his life has been spent. Nor do we need to feel that he is in any sense lost to us. The possession of Henry James is not a matter of his political allegiance, and it is one of the happy qualities of genius that it can give but never take away. Whatever a man like Henry James can do for the world, he must do not for Englishmen or Americans alone, but for all others who can enter into his work.

WILLIAM HALE THOMPSON, mayor of Chicago, is willing to be a candidate for President, "if the younger element in the Republican party wills it." This is a challenge to the adolescence of the entire United States. Mayor Thompson has framed up a platform—no income tax, no war tax, high tariff—but the question of his platform is utterly negligible. On a platform of no dog tax he would be equally strong. It is not the program that matters. It is the man. Mayor Thompson is no pompous statesman. He is a joyous exemplar of juvenility, a bouncing hero straight from the Golden Age. He is the man who introduced the lucky Billiken and the lucky elephant into politics. He is the man who rode into office in a boy scout's hat. The greenest and sappiest timber that exists in the Republican party, Mayor Thompson ought to appeal hugely to its very youngest element. He expresses in full measure the universal childish aspiration to the Presidency. Unless he ages considerably in the near future, or comes a cropper in his mayoralty, he may precipitate a great popular movement, Votes for Boys.

DOES the holding of public office deprive a man of those rights which he enjoys as a private citizen? Several Southern editors think it does, and that the Governor of Mississippi overstepped the bounds of good taste when he threatened to cut the throat of a man who charged him with stealing a bill. The error lies in a failure to distinguish between personal and official acts; the crime charged was official, but the language used was simply that between Southern gentlemen who disagreed upon the issues of the day. The case of another state in which an ex-governor threatened to cut the throat of a lieutenant-governor is not pertinent because it raises the extraneous issue as to whether it is wrong to kill a lieutenant-governor. The tolerant view is that a governor's private life is his own and that the state should support a man in the linguistic style to which he is accustomed.

GOVERNOR JOHNSON has refused to sign California's Public Defender bill. In the absence of stated reasons his rejection would seem to imply distrust of the particular measure rather than opposition to its inherent purpose. For a year and a half the office of Public Defender has existed in Los Angeles under the city charter. Its function in criminal practice is the defense of persons charged with crime and unable to retain counsel. A similar responsibility in harassing civil litigation is imposed, as well as the still more important duty of prosecuting civil demands of less than one hundred dollars. That means, in effect, prosecuting wage claims. The services of the defender, like those of public prosecutors, are without charge. For the poor this offers a readier access to redress: our specious "equality before the law" becomes the less a mockery. It may interest the opponents

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of innovation to know that in early Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence the public prosecutor was held to include defense among his duties. Such was the influence of this view upon the conception of his office that the defendant in a criminal proceeding was actually denied counsel. The argument was that "the king could do no wrong" and his representative, the crown prosecutor, would therefore cherish any rights which the prisoner might have; it was the misfortune of the undefended defendant that his situation was not improved by its absurdity. But the long-established right of private counsel has itself proved an inadequate protection for those too poor to engage counsel. And now comes the suggestion to revive the neglected rule of state defense. Los Angeles' success carried a general Public Defender bill through the California legislature. Salary provisions were loose, however, and many felt that the law as passed would invite corruption in some of the larger counties. This consideration may have weighed with Governor Johnson. At any rate, California evidently contemplates doing in fact what English theory at the time of the Stuart's pretended to do.

WILL irresponsible agitators never cease founding propagandist magazines? A new one has just come to light. It begins with a demagogic promise of the impossible—"prosperity for all the American people." Following up this bait to selfishness and envy, it makes the usual deceitful claim of non-partisanship, and immediately thereafter announces its support of a particular propaganda. We notice, however, no spiritual consideration in these pages. Are these agitators of the impression that their materialistic philosophy will bring a gain in grace? In order that intelligent citizens may be aware of the real nature of this new and subtly undermining influence, which gravely threatens the established order, we will unmask it. It pretends to defend "the rights of property," "the pillars of law and order," "American Institutions," "harmony," and it claims that "ages of experience" have taught that the interests of capital and labor "are identical." What it really seems to intend, however, is to reinstitute the legal favoritism of a high protective tariff, to bring about the anarchy of big business uncontrolled by law, and to enable employers to fight strikes with injunction and unpunished violence. It would be well to note for future reference the contributors to its pages. Among them are Elbert H. Gary, Nicholas Murray Butler, Henry Cabot Lodge, Elihu Root and a few others from whom more will be heard. The magazine is issued by a mysterious organization known as "The Republican National Press," and its name is *Prosperity*.

The Next Step

NO one supposes that Germany will formally accept the position taken in the President's note. It may be that in practice she will acquiesce. But the tone of even the most conservative German newspapers makes it clear that the acceptance of our demands is highly improbable. In the next few months we must base our expectations on the belief that Germany may sink a ship in a way that will compel our government to act. How we shall act is the supreme question of the moment. For half a century, since we fought for union, we have had to make no decision comparable to this. Mr. Wilson will in literal truth stake the future of the country upon his judgment. But he will not act on his opinion alone. Whatever he does, of this we can be assured: his policy will be a faithful interpretation of American thought. It will be as earnest an effort as a man ever made to represent the desires of his people.

What is our situation in regard to Europe? We are the victims of a war in which we were not consulted. In the course of that war we have seen our rights under international law whittled away bit by bit through the military necessities of Great Britain and Germany. England has stretched the list of contraband, has blockaded neutral ports, has exerted to its full capacity her dominion of the seas. She has treated us politely and humanely, but she has taken away our rights upon the highways of Europe. Germany has inaugurated the submarine policy and conducted it ruthlessly. She has created a reign of horror upon the seas by destroying innocent lives. She has not only broken the law, as England has; she has broken it with cruel violence. To the American mind her sin is infinitely greater than England's, and the clear fact of the situation is that America, supposedly dollar-ridden, will never judge as equal offences the stoppage of trade and the killing of innocent people.

To protect our lives we are ready to take the most extreme measures. We are ready, reluctantly, to go to war. But immediately a paradox rises up to confront us. Can we by going to war achieve the purpose of the war? Would war with Germany safeguard innocent lives either now or in the future? It would not. By no military operation now can we secure that freedom of the seas for which we are contending. An American army in Flanders, the American navy in British waters, would not only fail to protect American lives upon the sea; it would abolish the last incentive remaining to Germany to moderate her policy in any respect. She could do her worst then and lose nothing by it. And in the meantime we should have ceased to be the champions of neutral rights. We should have

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

to forego our controversy with England, acquiesce in her naval policy, and abandon the little neutral powers altogether. We should become one of the Allies. We should have to pool our resources with them, agree not to make a separate peace; we should be fighting for Constantinople and Trieste. The original quarrel about submarines would be lost in the mêlée, and we should find that the attempt to uphold our neutrality had been transformed into participation in a world war. We should be a partner of the Allies, and not a very important one at that. We should be committed to their policies for the settlement of Europe with all the enormous consequences which that involves.

Now it may be that there are the greatest reasons why we should join the Allies in a war against Germany. Many Americans believe there are. They hold, as we do, that the crushing of England and France would endanger our future. THE NEW REPUBLIC acknowledges that the time may possibly come when American military intervention will be needed. To become one of the Allies would cost us internally and externally so terrible a price that only the coolest determination in the most terrible necessity would justify it. Above all we cannot afford to enter the war thoughtlessly, without full realization of its meaning. We cannot afford to drift into the war merely to assert rights which military action cannot secure. If we are going to stake our future, in the name of sanity let us know that we are doing it. Let us state with perfect clearness that we are determined to fight Germany not alone on account of her submarine policy, but because we fear her dominion of the world.

If we interpret correctly preponderant American feeling, it is that some action is required against Germany, but that a general participation in the war is more than the circumstances demand. We realize that an endless exchange of notes will be futile. We feel that some act is needed to emphasize our position. We know that military action cannot be effective at least for a very long time. Is it not clear then that America is in the mood and in the situation to adopt some new form of international coercion? The old-fashioned kind of war does not meet the conditions. Is it not necessary then to invent a new way of making war?

We are in a peculiarly favorable position to experiment with the propaganda made on page 327 by Mr. Norman Angell. They have several obvious advantages. They are definitely aimed at the particular issue; they do not involve a military alliance with the Allies; they are weapons which will keep clear the fact that we are upholding international law; they are a form of coercion suited to express our opinion about German policy. And for the future they represent an advance in world organization of the greatest significance. They are as well adapted as military action to safeguarding our rights at sea. To be sure they will not "crush" Germany, but neither would our army and navy. Nor would we wish to "crush" Germany if we could. To be sure they would not greatly alter the military situation, but neither would our going to war. What they will do is to furnish a way of acting against Germany which at once condemns her as unfit for the society of nations while it enables us to decline responsibility for Russian, Japanese and Italian policy in Europe. If our statesmanship could carry through some such program as Mr. Angell suggests, it would meet the issue as well as it can be met, and at the same time it would make the United States a real champion of neutral rights and a leader in the placing of civilized sanctions behind international law.

American Finance Finds Itself

AS one looks back over the past year and notices the way in which this country reacted from the shock of the war, one cannot resist a feeling of deep chagrin. We were not unlike a screaming giant in baby clothes, who was pushed off the dock and left to sink or swim. The baby was almost paralyzed by a sense of its own impotence. That the United States was the country of greatest economic resourcefulness in the world, the most productive country, the most complacently self-sustaining, the one with the largest single stock of gold, a country neutral and physically detached—all of that the nation belittled, and considered only its weaknesses. What would it do without the European capital it was wont to import? What would it do for want of European goods, like dyes and chemicals, that were essential to the continuous processes of American industry? There would be a market for wheat, but what would become of the cotton crop, unless the United States Treasury bought it to save the South from utter ruin?

The most immediate question concerned itself with the current account owed by Wall Street to London. This debt, annually contracted in the pursuits of finance and commerce and later discharged by exportation of American goods, amounted to perhaps half a billion dollars. International exchange of goods being suddenly paralyzed, London wished the balance settled in gold, and Wall Street in its panic had neither the courage to face the demand nor the wit to perceive its futility. New York bankers, the Secretary of the Treasury, and two agents of the British Exchequer, conferred for several weeks on how we should pay Europe.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Eventually the problem solved itself. In August, 1914, Wall Street's paramount idea was to protect the American stock of gold and postpone payment of half a billion dollars on current accounts to Europe. In July, 1915, exports to Europe had exceeded imports from Europe to the incredible amount of a billion dollars during the twelve months, vast sums of bank credit had been placed at the disposal of foreign governments, France had pawned American railroad bonds in Wall Street to raise more funds with which to buy more goods, and so altered were the conditions that construction had already begun on new factories for the manufacture of war orders.

The early pessimism of the Wall Street bankers with regard to their ability to pay our current obligations to London found a parallel in the pessimism of other sections of the American business public. Capital went into hiding. Several steel companies deferred their dividends. Railroad reorganization plans were abandoned. The City of New York was obliged to pay more than six per cent in Wall Street for the sum of one hundred million dollars to pay off securities matured in Europe. The Secretary of the Treasury accused the banks of hoarding money, as they were doing, and of hoarding it to raise the price of credit, although in reality such was not their motive. The truth was that the banks, like everyone else, were frightened. Business took in sail. Unemployment became national in scope. Conditions seemed as bad as they could be, and yet our business pessimists proclaimed that the worst was yet to come.

This pessimism was exemplified in the appeal of the Eastern railroads to the Interstate Commerce Commission for permission to raise rates. The appeal for a reopening of this case, which had been decided only a few months before, was made on the ground that new and wholly unprecedented conditions had appeared. The railroads said that an increase of rates was imperative for several reasons: that the credit of railroad securities had to be supported against an impending avalanche of foreign liquidation; that railroads were cut off from those supplies of European capital upon which they were wont to rely; that the volume of business had diminished at an alarming rate on account of the disorganization of commerce by war; that the unparalleled destruction of capital in Europe would oblige the railroads in future to borrow less and depend more upon their revenues for improvement and construction funds, and that "it is certain that the competition for capital will be keener and interest rates higher for some years to come than in any corresponding period." In other words, the case of the railroads was based upon the assumption that the war would have an immediately calamitous economic and financial consequence.

But these consequences were slow in appearing. Already the baby giant had recovered from the first shock, had stopped blubbering and was beginning to swim. Without any miraculously created American merchant marine to carry our goods to Europe, exports were prodigiously increased. Europe sent ships for grain, cotton, meat and war supplies. Before the end of the year 1914 the question was not how we should pay Europe, but how Europe should pay us. Europe began to ask for credit here. She could not pay in gold for what she bought. Would we trust her? Would we not sell on credit? The proposal first seemed dangerous because of its novelty. Then we took stock of our strength. We could well afford to sell on credit and we began to do it.

Nor was the prophecy that American railroad securities would have to be supported against an avalanche of foreign liquidation confirmed by events. We soon learned to our evident surprise that the foreign holders of American securities were reluctant to sell them, for a reason that Wall Street had never thought of, to wit, that a great neutral country in a position to supply the belligerent nations with quantities of war munitions, was a very good place to keep one's money. On November 28, 1914, the Stock Exchange was opened guardedly, with a range of "minimum prices" below which transactions could not take place. That was to say to Europe: "You may sell our securities back to us only so cheap and no cheaper." The amount of foreign liquidation that appeared on these terms was negligible, and gradually all restrictions were removed. There was then a free market for securities—the only one in the world—and prices instead of falling began to rise. In many issues, called "war stocks," of which Bethlehem Steel is one, sensational advances took place. The average price of all stock advanced to a higher level than was touched in the first half of 1914.

Equally wrong were the railroads in assuming that the destruction of capital in Europe would prevent American railroads from securing capital for needed improvements. There has, it is true, been quite as much destruction of capital in Europe as had been expected. War loans have exceeded all estimates. The British government has raised its rate of interest to 4½ per cent; but although a year ago anyone would have argued that such events would inevitably raise the price of capital in this country and make borrowing prohibitive to the railroad, no such conclusion followed. The price of American capital has not risen perceptibly, and capital in plenty is still accessible to the borrower. On June 29, 1915, New York City sold a large

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

issue of 4½ per cent stock at a slight premium, to yield the investor 4.43 per cent. On May 20, 1913, it sold 4½ per cent stock at a smaller premium, to yield the investor 4.49 per cent. That is to say, the price of capital to New York City was a little lower in June, 1915, than it was two years before. The average net yield of a selected group of ten railroad bonds, charted by *The Annalist*, during the first half of 1915 was 4.37 per cent, against 4.21 per cent during the first half of 1914. New security issues in Wall Street in the first half of 1915 were only 10 per cent less than in the corresponding half of 1914. Rates of interest on call loans, time money and commercial paper were all lower in the first half of 1915 than during the first six months of 1914. The Federal Reserve banking system, inaugurated since the outbreak of the war, has affected both the supply of commercial funds and the price of credit favorably to the borrower, but the actual lending power of the Federal Reserve banks, additional to that of the National banks, has hardly been utilized; and in any case, the increased lending power of the dollar through the advent of Federal Reserve banks, and the lowering of reserve requirements generally, should affect only commercial credit and not the supply or price of fixed capital. As for the railroads, fixed capital has been no harder to borrow this year than last. It is notable that reorganization plans abandoned in 1914 have been brought to fruition recently. The Missouri Pacific will raise $41,000,000 by assessing its shareholders. It happens to be a Western road, and therefore one that did not participate in the freight-rate advance.

What the ultimate effect will be we cannot predict. It is probable that if the war continues the cost of American capital will rise, and it is also probable that living will be more expensive. We are not, however, so confident of the economic effects of this war upon America as we were a year ago. Economic prophecies are more reserved. We are beginning to understand that the mere fact of war alters the intricate economic relations upon which our facile predictions were made. How far consumption may be decreased and production increased under the compulsion of necessity is an element which vitally affects all our economic relations and opens the door to a hope that conditions may not develop as disadvantageously as had been feared. Germany has shown us how a nation may become isolated from a world economic unity without being shattered. England, France and other nations show great powers of adaptation under new and difficult conditions. It is not to be assumed without more proof than we have that American finance and American business will not adjust themselves to conditions brought about by the war.

The Eastland

IN Chicago on Saturday morning, July twenty-fourth, at seven o'clock the excursion steamship Eastland lay at the Clark Street dock carrying over two thousand lives.

At about ten minutes past seven the Eastland began to rock away from the dock, to the north, under the moving weight. She could not be righted. She overturned. The catastrophe drowned a multitude of men, women and children.

The enumeration of the dead from the city coroner's workers at two o'clock on Monday morning ran from one thousand to twelve hundred. For two days Chicago has been a city of the dead. The tugs have been dragging the river; the flags at half mast. The families of the missing have been searching for their lost among the long lines of stark, muffled figures in the morgue.

Most of the known dead are working people from Hawthorne who had gone to the Eastland as one of five excursion boats chartered for the lake picnic of the Western Electric Company. Of Bohemian, German, Scandinavian, Polish and American birth, great numbers of those who were drowned here in the center of our country were in the flower of their youth and strength. The loss of young life in the catastrophe is overwhelming. On Sunday morning none of the identified dead of his parish who had been found and been reported to the Polish priest at Hawthorne were beyond the nineteenth year.

In the presence of this great common bereavement, everyone is asking in grave question, doubt, and the rising sense of public responsibility, "Why did this happen? Was the law broken? Was the Eastland crowded beyond the limit of the law?"

It has not now been ascertained, it is indeed now regarded as improbable, that at the time of the disaster more persons were on the boat than the law allowed. The law, it seems, allowed twenty-five hundred people on the Eastland. A more serious consideration has arisen. Those who have seen the public suffering in Chicago in the last two days are asking, "Did our government and our national law itself license a realized danger for human life on the Great Lakes? It is as though we had suddenly learned that the sentry we have placed to guard us is at his post but feels no concern in protecting us from disaster. His form is present, but his interest in watching over our lives is absent."

Weight is added to this serious consideration, this new conception of the government's attitude, by the record of the Seaman's Union in its correspondence with governmental authorities at Washington concerning dangers to the public in the condition of Great Lake shipping.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

For twenty-two years the Seaman's Union has been calling the attention of the government to the dangers of Great Lake travel. One may read its correspondence for ten years back asking the national government for investigation of these dangerous conditions. One may read letters of the last year and a half signed by Mr. Victor Olander, the secretary, and quoting to the Department of Commerce case after case showing the necessity for an inquiry.

In Chicago, as the most populous port of the Great Lakes, the extent of the tragedy upon their waters is more seriously realized than throughout the rest of the country. The events on our inland waters alluded to in the Seaman's Union correspondence are perhaps more familiar in the Middle West than nationally. In the last ten years thirty-one vessels, passenger and freight steamers, schooners, fishing vessels, have been completely lost on the Great Lakes with every creature on board. In one terrible year alone (1913-14) twelve vessels and all their human cargo left port never to return. Their fates are unknown. They have vanished. The rest is silence.

Among the freight vessels lost with all on board was the Benjamin Noble. According to well-witnessed statement in the Union correspondence, she was so heavily laden with steel rails that her decks were awash, and the inspectors who allowed her to leave port on her last voyage made their inspection in rubber boots. Judge Tuttle's comment on the case was, "She was overloaded." It is noteworthy that the Union letter on a request for inquiry made because of the instance of the overloading of the Benjamin Noble received from Washington only a disparaging and unsatisfactory reply.

The steamer Marquette and Bessemer, No. 2, carrying freight, foundered on the Lakes with everyone on board, though without a numerous loss of life. Federal investigation was requested and was not made, although the steamer Pere Marquette, No. 18, a boat of the same type as the Marquette and Bessemer, was running on the Lakes and permitted to carry two thousand passengers daily. In the fall, after the loss of the Marquette and Bessemer, at a period of lighter travel than through the summer, the Pere Marquette also sank on the Lakes with all the twenty-seven souls upon her.

No representation of these occurrences in Lake traffic on the part of the Seaman's Union has brought the exhaustive public investigation and publication of its results which tragedies so serious and so repeated have seemed to demand. As one hears certain responses from the Departmental replies from Washington, the general impression is that they are disparaging, evasive and obstructive. They do not exhibit a clear-eyed and zealous interest in learning the cause of these disasters. They betray no purpose of working keenly and responsibly to prevent their recurrence.

What ought to be done specifically, to safeguard life on the Great Lakes? Mr. Olander, the secretary of the Union, answers clearly. "No vessel should be allowed to take on board more people than she can provide with life boats. She should have sufficient stability, so she will not capsize with her full capacity of living weight on one side—and that, without water ballast. If any ballast is used to obtain this condition, it should be solid ballast fastened to the boat."

This conclusion points, as we have said elsewhere, to the need of expert servants of the people. Little is ever to be gained in the attempt to alter a widespread, general wrong condition by hunting down one man. Much is to be gained by an unbiassed view of that general wrong condition, and the specific interest in changing it.

Not only the Eastland catastrophe, but the destruction of the Slocum, the closed exits of the Iroquois Theatre and the Triangle fire, the mine disaster at Cherry, all have made for us again and again, an unescapable comment. All have told us that our American departmental officers in city, in state and in the nation in general have been inexpert, and therefore ineffectual and unconcerned, in their tremendous task of protecting human life.

Not in the representations of owners or their sheer financial greed, not in upholding inadequate laws and rulings, should the interest of these officers for one instant lie, but absolutely in their difficult and serious duty of the expert protection of the safety of multitudes. Such community tragedies as have been mentioned will continue in the United States until we have faced this truth about them.

The New
REPUBLIC
A Journal of Opinion

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1915, IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA BY THE REPUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY, INC., 421 WEST TWENTY-FIRST STREET, NEW YORK, N. Y. HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT. ROBERT HALLOWELL, TREASURER.

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY — WALTER LIPPMANN
PHILIP LITTELL — FRANCIS HACKETT
WALTER E. WEYL — CHARLOTTE RUDYARD

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTIONS, FIFTY-TWO ISSUES, FOUR DOLLARS IN ADVANCE. SINGLE COPIES TEN CENTS. CANADIAN SUBSCRIPTION FOUR DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE. FOREIGN SUBSCRIPTIONS FOR COUNTRIES IN THE POSTAL UNION, FIVE DOLLARS PER YEAR IN ADVANCE.

REMITTANCE TO BE MADE BY INTERNATIONAL POSTAL MONEY ORDER. ENTERED AS SECOND CLASS MATTER, NOVEMBER 6, 1914, AT THE POST OFFICE AT NEW YORK, N. Y. UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A New Kind of War

MUST America either lamely accept with humiliating inertia a gross violation of her own right and dignity and of the common interest, or else take part in a war which, however successful, will not necessarily advance in the least degree the objects for which she fights—the future safety of her citizens and respect of their rights in war time, a better international law and its more scrupulous future observance—and which conceiveably might even render those objects more remote than ever? Is there no third course? Events have already pointed to a possible one.

Great Britain is at this moment engaged in negotiating with the merchants of neutral countries as to the conditions upon which they shall be allowed to trade with one another, the object of course being to prevent Germany securing supplies of any kind through neutral sources. This amounts obviously to an attempt to control the international trade of the world in such a way as to serve Great Britain's military purposes.

The United States government—as apart from certain of her merchants—has of course refused to take part in these negotiations, for obvious reasons. This claim to dictate the conditions of trade between neutrals, irrespective of blockade and contraband as heretofore understood, constitutes a very pregnant development of belligerent rights at sea. However much the American people may approve England's general cause in this war, the American government could not allow such development to become by precedent an accepted part of sea law, because in some future war such functions might be exercised by a power other than England on behalf of a cause of quite other character than that now being supported by England. Moreover, it is freely alleged by American merchants that British control of neutral trade is not exercised impartially; that, while on the ground of preventing supplies reaching Germany Britain has excluded American merchandise from neutral ports, British goods of the same kind have been going to those ports in increasing quantities. Whatever of truth there may be in this allegation, it is evident that if ever belligerent right expanded into the formal recognition of the kind of control over neutral trade aimed at by Great Britain, it is just such abuses as these that neutrals would in future suffer. The whole matter is at this moment the subject of very serious negotiation between Washington and London and the cause of some ill feeling between sections of the two countries.

Yet this very situation might, in the event of rupture of diplomatic negotiations between America and Germany, be so handled as to become not merely a means of solving the special and present American difficulties concerning neutral rights and interests, but of achieving the larger purpose of developing a really civilized international law and finding some means of enforcing it more efficient than the very clumsy instrument military force has proven itself so far to be.

Out of the Anglo-American negotiations might develop an understanding affording means of avoiding the absurd stultification which mere military cooperation with the Allies would involve for America —the position, that is, of fighting a war to assure the victory of one side, to find after the war, perhaps, that that side is as much opposed to any form of international law at sea which will really protect American and neutral right and interest as is the beaten side.

For, if the suggestion which follows proves feasible, the constructive development of international law and of some sanction enabling the community of nations to enforce it, would not await the end of war nor be dependent upon a definite victory of one side, but would take place during the war and would later still be operative even though the Allies were not decisively victorious in a military sense.

Let us assume a rupture of diplomatic relations between America and Germany—a contingency which recent events seem to render altogether probable. America would in such an event in any case put her defences in as thorough order as possible, though the likelihood of Germany sending an army across the Atlantic at this juncture is, to say the least, small. But American naval force would probably prepare to be in a position to convoy ships.

America should certainly make it plain to Germany—and to the Allies, for that matter—that the absence of American military cooperation with the armies now fighting Germany was not due to mere indifference to the causes involved, still less to a desire selfishly to avoid the cost and suffering of war in the achievement of her purpose, but because both her own and the larger and ultimate general interest could be more effectively achieved by another form of cooperation, which would be as follows:

America would offer to settle the whole contraband and blockade dispute with England on the basis of making international that virtual control of overseas trade of the world which England now exercises. That is to say, all that international trade now affected by British action should still be

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

subject to control for the definite purpose of preventing Germany securing supplies; but that control should be exercised not arbitrarily by Great Britain, but by all the Allies plus the United States, and with the unofficial cooperation of the remaining neutrals as well. Prize courts and courts of control should not be British but representative of all these powers. The arrangement would in the circumstances amount to an international control of the world's supplies for the purpose of withholding them from Germany, and in such a way as to avoid difficulty between the combatants and between them and the neutrals, and as to render the blockade or seige of Germany effective not merely by sea power, but by cooperation between the nations of the world as a whole.

Such an international body made up of representatives of America, Britain and her colonies, France, Russia, Italy, Belgium, Japan and, less officially, of the Scandinavian and Balkan states, Holland, Switzerland and Greece, would not deal merely with matters of exports and imports, with trade between them, but with financial arrangements as well—with exchange and credit difficulties, loans, censorship of mails and all the thorny problems that have arisen during the war. From these matters it might perhaps proceed to deal with such problems as the disposal of German property—interned ships, businesses of various kinds, royalties on patents, bank balances and so forth—and, it may be, more remote arrangements as to the future control of German action in the world: tariff arrangements; the conditions upon which Germany should at the peace be once more admitted to the community of nations, whether on equal terms or not; whether the most efficient means of exacting some indemnification for damage done might not be by sequestration of German property throughout the world and possibly some surtax by tariff, ship and mail dues, all of course subject to due legal judgment of an international court.

In short, there would be in the bodies so created, the beginnings of the world organization of our common resources, social, economical and political, for the purpose of dealing with a recalcitrant member of international society, by other than purely military means—a starting point whence international law might be made a reality, a code, that is, not merely expressing the general interest but sanctioning processes which furnish means of enforcing respect for it.

This control would center at first mainly in America, since during the course of the war the activities and resources of the existing belligerent nations would more and more be absorbed by military operations, thus making America the largest single source of supplies, money and ammunition. If the United States were to assume the responsibility of furnishing munitions and material upon such terms as to sustain British credit and liberate an increasing proportion of the European manufacturing population for military service, this country could by purely economic cooperation make a decisive contribution to the coercion of Germany.

But though America's economic position would be dominant at such juncture, she should deliberately internationalize the control it would imply, not using it to impose an American view, but for the purpose of securing adherence to the common rules drawn up for the common good.

Let us see how far the general method here indicated might apply to a later situation of the war. If Europe is to crush Germany within her own borders, and keep her crushed, it will be at the price of the Prussianization of the whole of Europe. To exact indemnities from Germany will mean the military occupation of her territories and that means the maintenance perhaps for many years of large armies by the Allies. To break up the German Empire would mean the annexation of some of her territory and the turning of the Allies into conquerors and military rulers of alien —German—populations. And yet the alternative for Europe is to allow Germany after the peace to build up her strength and wealth, so involving the possibility, five or ten or fifteen years hence, of a recuperated Germany still dreaming of world domination. That is to say, that would be the alternative if the action of the western world were limited to military action. But if we can assume the international control of the world's wealth in some such a way as that above indicated, well established, having gone on for some time, there would be a situation in which the channels of trade would for prolonged periods have been turned away from Germany and a situation also in which, for instance, Germany's enemies would control virtually every pound of cotton grown in the world. And the needs of the war would have engendered between those enemies much mutual hopefulness in the way of loans, credit arrangements, etc., with their resources organized and their action coordinated by central international organs. If such a situation really existed, German aggression would be faced by forces that mere military power could not meet.

Two or three obvious objections will be urged to the course just outlined. It will be said that by the proposed action America would have sacrificed her neutrality and created a state of war with Germany. Of course; and if Germany cared to avail herself of existing international law to insist on that point it would simplify America's action. But it would be an academic point raised by Ger-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

many. She could hardly oblige America to send troops to Europe, and just for the moment she is not in a position to send troops here. The meaning which America shall give to a "state of war" is in the actual circumstances mainly America's affair; and if she cares to put the emphasis of her effort upon the development of other than military forces, how can Germany prevent that? And why should America worry as to the precise meaning which Germany may attach to "a state of war"?

It will also be urged that in cooperating in the suggested control over neutral trade America would be guilty of the very violation of international law of which she is now accusing England. But there would be no violation of law on America's part. America would have no right to dictate to Britain just what the latter should or should not sell to Holland—which is the counterpart of what Britain is trying to do to America; but America and England have a perfect right to agree together just what they will and will not export to Holland—which is the character of the world control embodied in the suggestion. And if, in arranging for the control of their exports, those nations and others desire to put Holland to as little inconvenience as possible and for that purpose offer to consult with her, they do violence neither to Holland's rights nor to international law. It is true that the ultimate outcome, and the one definitely aimed at by America, would be a radical change of international law, especially with reference to the future nature of neutrality, but that again would be by consent of the community of nations as a whole. The obligation of the individual to obey the law of the community does not exclude the right of the community to change the law, nor of individuals to work towards such change by general consent. An act which is absolutely inadmissible as the right of an individual acting with no reference to the community may be perfectly admissible as the act of the community sanctioned by the common will. It is these distinctions indeed which alone make society possible.

And a final objection: "Why not declare war in the ordinary way and aid in the military defeat of Germany by sending troops to Europe?" Because to do so would be to identify this country with the military policy of the Allies, and that means ultimately with the political policy as well; it would mean adhesion to the arrangement by which no Ally makes a separate peace, and would thus tie American action to the political complications of Europe; it would prevent America's leaving the door open for the reëstablishment at a later date of diplomatic relations with Germany, and so serving as mediator; it would, by dividing American energies between military and economic cooperation, prevent her putting all the emphasis of effort upon that international economic organization which may be effective where, at least so far in history, mere military victory has been ludicrously ineffective. And finally the Allies need munitions, material and money, more than they need men.

But the major point is that America can at this juncture give what none of the combatants can give: a lead in the organization of at present unorganized forces that may lay the foundations of a new society of the nations. To that end she should direct her efforts.

NORMAN ANGELL.

Arithmetic of the Armies

THE Swiss military writers have so far as possible compiled figures on all the armies except the Russian, and the average of these figures is interesting. The accepted unit is a battalion of 1,000 men.

WEST FRONT	
Germans	1,100
French	1,100
English	185
Belgians	65
(giving the Allies 250 superiority.)	
EAST FRONT	
Germans	700
Austrians	650
Russians	1,500(?)
SOUTHWEST FRONT	
Austrians	160
Italians	505

The Servian and Montenegrin forces are not considered, being practically inactive; but the Servians can probably still advance 100 battalions. I have as yet seen no figures of any value on the forces at the Dardanelles, nor those on the Caucasus front.

The above figures include only the infantry and the immediate infantry reserves. Thus a British force in camp near Boulogne would not be included. The western front is 600 kilometers, say 375 miles long, giving an average of 3.6 battalions to the mile along the whole front from Switzerland to the Channel. Of course, these forces are not distributed evenly, but generally speaking, the strengthening of one sector of the line means the weakening of another sector somewhere else, and in Swiss military circles it is not believed that more than 75 German battalions were withdrawn from the west to take part in the Galician campaign.

Now it is evident that this numerical superiority of the Allies—1,350 to 1,100—is not sufficient to warrant a general frontal attack on a front, say, of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

20 miles, unless there is also superiority in artillery, munitions of war, generalship and morale. At the present time the Germans are still equally well supplied with artillery and munitions and can move troops at least as quickly. As regards generalship and the morale of the German troops I can see no decline; only an increasing numerical superiority in men and in munitions can defeat them.

The French can be expected to do no more than hold their own. The Belgians cannot even do that, as their reserves are sure soon to be exhausted. Therefore the British must accept the brunt of the work on the west front. At present they are holding only 37½ miles—one-tenth of the line. This time next year they should be holding 125 miles, or one-third of the line, provided a vital effort is to be made.

No nation now at war, except the British, can be expected to create new units; their efforts will be limited to maintaining their forces, in spite of losses, at their present strength. In every European country there is a depot for each regiment through which losses are made good. In France it is like this:

DEPOT 70TH REGIMENT		
Male Effectives		15,000
70th Regiment (active)	3,000	
" (1st Reserve)	2,500	
" (Territorials)	3,000	8,500
Balance for losses		6,500

From these simple figures it can be easily seen that the military strength of a country is by no means unlimited, and Germany and Austria have fewer men. German organization is beyond praise but it cannot bring a dead man to life. Therefore the Germans know that they must make peace before their numerical inferiority begins to tell, as it is sure some time to do. Victories are no use to them. To overrun half Russia would not help them unless by so doing they could destroy Russia's military power, and this they have heretofore never hoped to do.

To break, at least temporarily, Russia's offensive power; to withdraw from Austria all German troops, leaving to that unfortunate nation the task of defending her own borders; likewise to withdraw every available German effective from Poland and the Baltic provinces; and then to strike once more at Calais and at Paris—that is Germany's best chance. Provided Germany cannot get the kind of peace she wants—and she cannot get it now—then the fight must be fought to a finish as soon as possible, and it is on the west front only that a decision can be quickly reached.

Personally, I expect to see a German offensive begin in France by September, and I expect to see that offensive fail; but by winning such a campaign Germany can still win the war, and I believe she will try. For otherwise she must face a campaign of attrition which will kill her in the end like a slow but deadly disease.

GERALD MORGAN

The Unbroken Chain

PART I

A FEW weeks ago at the Salon d'Automne I strolled through its retrospective exhibition, where the masters of the nineteenth century, unrecognized while they lived but admired to-day, reign in melancholy state. Then I reached the galleries of more modern painting; there, before the flamboyant grimaces of "Fauves" and the austere charades of cubists, a bevy of fashionable people relieved their furtive boredom in spasms of hilarity. "Because painters are insulted in this fashion," I reflected, "does it necessarily follow that they possess greater talent than I attribute to them?"

Delacroix, whose harmonies were never perceived by his contemporaries, remarked with lugubrious irony: "Oculos habent et non vident," a dictum invariably true of the public to-day, and of all times; it should be ceaselessly repeated to a public only too apt to delude itself. Everyone is inclined to believe that in order to read the book of nature he need only open his eyes, unaware that there is hardly one person in a thousand who sees with his own eyes. The average man's vision is the product of his environment, based, though he does not know it, on a composite of conventions, both practical and intellectual, made necessary by our intercourse with others, our need, if we are to live with them, of thinking with them, of having a common language, a sort of "Volapük" as Gaugin has said. But the first duty of any artist is to renounce his share in this lying compromise and to see for himself.

"Why won't you paint what you see?" Couture asked Manet.

"I paint what I see," replied Manet, "not what others see."

The breach that has existed for a century be-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tween painters and their public comes of this violent dissension between a small number of men possessing intrepid eyesight, and the human herd determined to impose its anonymous vision on everyone. Some such conflict, more or less intense, has always existed. If by any chance that conflict could cease, it would be a disastrous sign that an epoch had fallen asleep in a shroud of flabby and apathetic uniformity. In every age great artists have brought the world a new or a partially new vision which we no longer distinguish in the perspective of history, for at a distance the rust of antiquity fills in many gaps. But there are chasms separating one generation of the Italian Renaissance from another, Botticelli from Leonardo, Ghiberti from Michelangelo, Titian from Tintoretto. The conflict is more strident to-day, primarily because the advent of a sovereign people, democratic salons and the plebescite of newspapers, bring art into daily conflict with a greater number of ignorant minds,* but above all because the painter's world has been completely rehabilitated. What a miracle life is! A land that at moments had seemed barren suddenly became fertile. An ancient and indefatigable tree branched anew. After so many centuries of art, a new vision of the universe flowered. Painting has been more completely transformed by it than music has been since Beethoven. The eighty years which have passed in France from the advent of Delacroix to the death of Cezanne will remain in history a period equal to any of the most glorious epochs of art. If the public to-day is not sufficiently aware of the fact, it is on account of the bewildering violence of the movement itself and the impetuous energy of so many unique personalities. In seeming to antagonize one another they blind weak eyes and startle timid minds into crying "anarchy" and craving the restoration of order at any cost—order being typified for the occasion by some humdrum academic tradition. But a calmer scrutiny of the facts reveals the innate logic which dominates this evolution and the unbroken chain which links these masters of the Restoration to those of the Third Republic. . . . The strain and balance of two opposing forces constitute the soul of our epoch. Let us examine its complex unity.†

The impetus begins with Delacroix. He is a world in himself. In the entire history of painting I know of no more phenomenal balance of critical insight and creative imagination, of science and of art. He is the conqueror of a new kingdom of color, and from the beginning of his life to the end, from "Dante and Virgil," 1822, which even then seemed revolutionary, to the "Massacre of Scio," 1824, which scandalized Gerard and Gross, to the "Women of Algiers" in 1834, "The Barque of Don Juan," 1841, and the "Chapel of the Angels" at St. Sulpice, 1861, his progress never ceased. He became constantly more lucid and yet more fervid, attaining a calm audacity that combined, as has been said, wisdom worthy of Goethe with the virtuosity of a Paganini. He appropriated all the treasures of the past and present, Rubens, Veronese, Constable, Turner, oriental tradition, the scientific researches of Bourgeois and Chevreuil. The most divergent masters of subsequent generations invoke him. Renoir studied him ceaselessly and attempted to rival him. Signac credits him with the invention of neo-impressionistic technique. Gaugin sighed for his tumultuous poise. Cezanne penetrated his magic atmosphere and dreamed of painting an "Apotheosis of Delacroix." He is the first of the great painters to treat color deliberately as music; he tests all its harmonic resources; he uses pure color, small touches in juxtaposition, polychrome hatching, optical mixtures. He consciously composes romantic symphonies, and their turmoil is invariably dominated by his solid reason.

Too great for his epoch, all his life, as he said, "thrown to the lions," he saw dominant about him the classic school of Ingres to which the poet-landscapists of Fontainebleau, isolated in serene contemplation, left the field free. But as a result of immanent justice this school aided the unfolding of realism. One of Ingres' most intelligent pupils, Amaury Duval, confessed in 1878, "I firmly believe that in restoring to art the more lifelike simulation of nature, Ingres has overthrown the school of David, and by this revolution brought to birth the realism which is overwhelming us."

Before insipid versions of people and things Courbet flaunted the challenge of his robust naturalism which, like some acrobat parading before the booth of a fair, displayed his magnificent craftsmanship and his denial of the ideal. Painter of democracy, hymned by Proudhon, he was nevertheless modern only in his choice of subjects; his idiom remains classic. But from his rich and powerful pigment leapt a dark wavering flame: Manet, intelligent, ironic, irritable, subtle, a Parisian of Parisians, essentially a painter of modern men and women. Acclaimed by Zola, termed by Baudelaire

*There is no reason to suppose that during the height of the Italian Renaissance one might not have witnessed similar conflicts. I cannot forget that the first impulse of the Florentines was to hurl stones at Michelangelo's David when the statue first leapt into the light. [Author's Note.]

†I make no pretense here of indicating any others but those who have led the assault. It is self-evident that a man can be a great artist, as Puvis de Chavannes was, and remain outside the battle or above it. [Author's Note.]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"the first in the degeneration of his art," he found himself placed at the turning of the ways, beginning with Courbet and ending with the impressionists whose elder brother he was.

One must admire in him the unexpected fertility of the human mind during its periods of resurrection. Manet never intended to combat Courbet's naturalism; rather he imagined that he could intensify it by stamping it with the seal of a direct impression, crude and immediate. "There is only one truth," he said, "to paint whatever one sees with the first brush stroke." Then forced to see and choose quickly, to condense his vision into a few precipitate brush strokes, he substituted for an impassive object the vibrant personality of the artist and the mobility of his sensations. If, in his own case, Manet's mordant and imperious personality kept his own sensibility well in hand, he nevertheless opened the door to unbridled subjectivism. Before 1870, Monet, Pissarro and Renoir grouped themselves about him as in Fantin-Latour's beautiful painting. Within a few years the disciples outstripped their master, and dragged him after them. . . . Monet, unlike Delacroix, did not shoulder the burden of the past. He belonged to a generation of revolutionists, capable of forgetting everything that had gone before, as Cezanne (one of their number) exhorted them to do. Monet created a new language, a simplified palette of seven or eight colors approximating the solar spectrum. He decomposed tones, multiplied their elements, employed a polyphony of checkered brush strokes, criss-crossed, juxtaposed. And with this luminous orchestra he intoned an inexhaustible hymn to the sun. All his work is nothing less than a succession of ecstatic odes to the glory of light.

The first collective exhibition of the impressionists was held in 1874. But their success was not definitely established until the '90's. By that time the tide was already ebbing and a reaction against them had defined itself among the younger men. The impressionists were pure lyricists enthralled by the radiant profusion of their experiences. "They painted as a bird sings." They were not preoccupied with composition or construction, and that soon became insupportable to French mentality. Impressionism, all in all, was little more than one man, the Shelley of painting, Claude Monet. Pissarro, the most intelligent of the group, remained a nomad, wandering from one novelty to another, and contributed no more to making impressionism than to unmaking it. Renoir protested that he "remained in the ranks," faithful to French tradition, in reality on his guard against nature. Hardly had Monet and his friends achieved complete expression when Seurat and Signac pretended to reduce impressionism to scientific laws, rational and immutable. In 1866 neo-impressionism appeared, with minute prescriptions for the arrangement of lines and the choice of colors, compiled with an air of imperious finality which recalls the school of Le Brun. The danger of anarchy, you see, is not great. No sooner does a somewhat untrammelled genius appear in France than an academy is born either to absorb or to combat him. In 1890 Maurice Denis published a manifesto in favor of "Neo-Traditionalisme." By that time Gaugin had already appeared on the scene.

Strangely enough this independent genius, intuitive, incomplete, paradoxical, and, as he said, "breaker of window panes," found himself allied to a group of distinguished but reflective minds, rationalistic, fearful of modern life. But Gaugin evidently found it to his advantage to allow Albert Aurier and Paul Serusier to codify his erratic assertions in a system which they gravely based on Hegelian metaphysics. So "Synthesism" or better "Symbolism" was born, whose joint exhibition was held in 1889. "The notion of nature seen through a temperament," wrote Maurice Denis, "was succeeded by the doctrine of equivalence or symbolism. We affirmed that moods, or states of mind evoked by any experience whatever, were paralleled in the artist's imagination by plastic symbols or equivalents capable of producing these emotions or moods, without necessarily reproducing a copy of the original experience. For every state of our sensibility there must be some objective harmony capable of translating it. Art is a creation of our mentality for which nature is only the pretext. Instead of working within the confines of vision, we quested in the mysterious center of thought itself, as Gaugin said. Minds impatient or weary of reality found refuge in dreams, and canonized as a principle of art 'the deformation of nature.'"

Everyone used this new freedom as his temperament dictated, Gaugin with his barbaric grace, his instinct for style and his decorative genius; Van Gogh, with the pathos of a great and tormented heart, in a tumult of fiery color schemes. But when these meteors were extinguished, the first in the remote waters of Oceania, the other snuffed out by a gust of madness, their splendor lingered in the eyes of those who had beheld them, and their dizzying example continued to draw artists further and further into the abysses of dream, into abstract color and abstract form. The delirious rapture of Van Gogh, an unbalanced Wagner of the world of color, led to the acrobatic virtuosity and the deliberate aberrations of a Richard Strauss—Henri Matisse—who intoxicates himself with pure color, barbaric, unrestrained, and knows nothing but color, neither law nor nature. In the impressive phrase of Maurice Denis, "The eye devours the head."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Meanwhile one great painter, Paul Cezanne, isolating himself from the fever of Paris, cloistered all his life in obstinate and relentless introspection, attempted to organize this chaos, to link the innovations of the present to the past, "to make of impressionism something solid and durable like the art in the museums," and to see modernity under the aspect of eternity. Despite serious defects of vision with which he struggled constantly, he succeeded in making himself the "Poussin of impressionism" in a few masterpieces, monumental in style, magic in color, inexpressibly profound. But, as usually happens, his immense influence on contemporary painters merely accentuated tendencies to which their natural bent already inclined them. What they retain of Cezanne is not his modesty before nature, his patient humility, but his audacious dream, continually shattered, of "dominating universal dynamics," of enclosing the mobile world in a deliberate synthesis of all the forces of being, which, rending the veil of appearance, would take root in a deeper reality.

ROMAIN ROLLAND.

(Chronique Parisienne, Bibliotheque Universelle et Revue Suisse, January, 1913.)

Translated by LEE SIMONSON.

Natural Leadership

WHEN children play "follow the leader" they express a human instinct or inclination which, loose and indeterminate as it is, can be forged into political fetters almost impossible to shake off. In any gang of rude boys strolling or romping together, there is almost always a protagonist in mischief, when there are not two. Some one is more impudent, more droll, quicker with his tongue, bigger, more courageous, or more vicious than the rest. Without premeditation and without remark he begins to give direction; and if another like him pulls the other way, two parties arise and interminable feuds. Not that such leadership is in the least useful. There is nothing to accomplish, except howling and rushing about, things which the herd is eminently able to do unguided. But the leader is a new and spontaneous source of suggestion for action, of command, and of judgment. Everyone finds it easier to follow than to resist his initiative, as it is easier to laugh than not to laugh when someone else is laughing loudly. We laugh, and are really amused, although we have no notion at what; or we may say we are amused at that foolish man laughing at nothing.

The sulking individual who holds back, merely because he has no reason for moving, loses all the fun. And when the pack is once off, the contagion of example is almost irresistible; and even the rare little heretic who is disgruntled and would resist soon finds the alternative of isolation more galling than the compulsion of that lawless orthodoxy. Rather than wither socially he will attempt to live contrary to his impulse or beyond his strength.

Hence those social tyrannies, more oppressive than any political despotism because more pervasive and searching, which are exercised by fashion, by custom, by party, by religion. Hence the almost entirely irrational *Sittlichkeit,* or code of manners, of nations and of classes.

There are moments, however, when any natural leadership, even that of the merely obstreperous, becomes casually useful. It is sometimes advantageous to be gregarious and to go with others, no matter where one goes. In war, of course, this is indispensable. The habit of giving command and of obeying is then a source of immense strength, even if the commander has no better lights and a worse will than the average soldier.

Ordinarily, however, this is hardly the case. A spontaneous leader must have some natural preeminence, or he would not have inspired obedience; and the fact that this natural preëminence is probably slight is a point in his favor, not indeed as an animal or a detached mind, but as a leader. Otherwise his impulses would not seem normal or be contagious, and he would not be esteemed. It is a condition of natural leadership not to be too superior. An average nature, with a slight increment of power, makes the representative man. What he does or thinks must be what everyone, if a little quicker, would have done or thought on his own account; only the leader precipitates the discharge. He is midwife, like Socrates, to the common will, and leads the people to do expeditiously what in their dull way they wished to do, and will congratulate themselves on doing. In that case the authority of the leader, whatever its origin, would turn out to be useful and just. Government by his will would be a morally representative government. It would cooperate with the interests which it affected.

Natural leadership of this sporting and competitive sort may be combined with an entirely different kind of ascendency, namely, paternal authority. Often there is a conflict between the two, for old men are selfish and slaves of habit; they can do better than young men only what they have long done in the same way, like making money or telling stories. Patriarchal government is not a development of natural leadership but of natural domination. The natural domination of a parent may be just and morally representative, when he brings up his children to do what is for their bene-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

fit rather than for his own; but there is this curious difference between such cooperation of an elder with a younger life and the cooperation of many wills under a spontaneous leader arising among them: what the father's foresight and care make for is the eventual interests of the children, whereas the natural leader of their own generation lets loose their actual and present wills. In Homer we have a picture of a society in the act of exchanging partriarchal for spontaneous leadership. The safe dull domination of Agamemnon and of Zeus is yielding to the brilliant and perilous inspirations of Odysseus and of Athena.

The human animal is so constituted that he cannot take two steps in life, political or moral, without becoming subject to leaders. But the innate disposition of human nature is so plastic and incomplete that there is no telling of what sort the leaders will be—fighters, talkers, saints, fops, or craftsmen. Even in the special field of politics, natural leadership may be secured by noble blood and manners, by eloquence, by conspicuous actions, by cajolery and good fellowship. The concrete result in every case is determined by a few blind initial choices and accidents. Monarchy is as human as democracy, a religious hierarchy grows up as easily as a commercial one. Once the ball is set rolling, its mass and momentum increase automatically and its direction cannot easily be changed; but the choice of natural leaders that first determined its movement was a matter of chance, and to find a different leader at the beginning might have been to found a different world.

GEORGE SANTAYANA.

A COMMUNICATION

The Case for England's Blockade

SIR: Your issue of July twenty-fourth is a great number on a great war, a credit to an able board of editors, and a shining example to American journalism of what a paper should be. With an evident desire to be strictly impartial between contestants whose purposes you lay bare but whose prejudices your care is to avoid, I cannot but feel that you have done a serious injustice to the English naval policy.

Thus at page 296 you suggest that if a blockade by Britain of the German coast by the old method—of close investment—has become impracticable by reason of the danger from enemy submarines, the blockade as a method of warfare should be given up, rather than that "a new and more sweeping assumption of power to interfere with neutral commerce" should be claimed. A fair reading of the history and prize decisions of our blockade of the coast of the Confederacy during our Civil War will show, I believe, that Britain need not make any new assumption of power over neutral commerce to justify what she is now doing in interference with neutral trade. Our own State Department has already recognized that the old order has been changed somewhat by modern methods of naval warfare—and this must be if international law is to grow with the changing world. The words of Chief Justice Marshall in 1816 are applicable to-day to the latest war: "It is the peculiarity of this war which requires the adoption of rules peculiar to a new state of things, in adopting which we must examine the principle on which a nation is justified in treating a neutral as an enemy." (1 Wheaton Reports 399.) In our Civil War we maintained not only a close investment of the coast-line but also a far-off blockading squadron to intercept commerce between Liverpool and Nassau and Havana; and Halifax and those and other ports of Great Britain, Cuba and Mexico. By an extension of the doctrine of "continuous voyage" and its derivative doctrine which a modern writer of high authority has named the doctrine of "continuous transport" we condemned ships and cargoes bearing goods of all kinds by way of neutral ports to and from the Confederacy. England accepted, with statesmanlike foresight, the extension of the doctrine, and other nations have since acted on it when their interest seemed to demand it.

To-day Britain, asserting the same principles of blockade, finds a close investment of the German coast impracticable, but she seems to maintain an effective cordon about that part of the German coast, west of Denmark, though at a considerable distance from the mines in those waters. Its effectiveness seems to be testified to by the number of neutral ships which she detains, and the infrequency with which we hear of one which safely penetrates the line of blockade. Modern warfare seems to require that large cargoes be brought into port for examination, but there is here no departure in essential principle from methods which we ourselves may sometimes be obliged to adopt, and wise statesmanship should recognize it without protest unless it be clearly unreasonable.

Again at page 293 of the same issue THE NEW REPUBLIC says in effect that Great Britain should "abandon her illegal suffocation of non-contraband American trade with Germany and with neutrals." The paragraph in question refers especially to the alleged grievances of our cotton shippers, but you will appreciate that if Britain has established an effective blockade of the German coast or a definite part thereof, all goods become liable to seizure when bound thereto, directly or indirectly, and whether in neutral bottoms or otherwise. *Dolus non purgator circuitu.*

Also you will, I presume, be ready to admit that even in the absence of an effective blockade goods in neutral bottoms may be seized by Great Britain, if the property of German subjects, as "enemy property," and regardless of its character as contraband strictly so-called. This, too, is in strict accordance with our own Civil War practice, and I fail to see how the case is altered by the fact that Germany and Great Britain were once parties to a Declaration of Paris which they choose now to disregard.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The United States was never a party to that declaration, and our citizens can hardly claim any rights under it.

Whatever protests we as a nation feel called on to make during the great war, should be made with a clear perception of the fact that some day we may ourselves be called on to conduct another war, and we should ask for no practice now from others that the United States may not freely and willingly concede to neutral nations in that so dire calamity.

W. D. S.

New York City.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Nearing Case

SIR: Before proceeding to request that you will correct an error into which you have fallen in the July seventeenth number of THE NEW REPUBLIC, in the article, "Who Owns the Universities," permit me to express my very great appreciation of your attitude on the Scott Nearing case. In the article mentioned you name five universities—Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Pennsylvania and Columbia. In the case of two of them, Harvard and Yale, you say a semblance of public control was maintained. The other three colleges you group together as presenting certain characteristics placing control absolutely in the hands of the board of trustees. With respect to the University of Pennsylvania, I beg to call attention to the following facts:

(1) The charter provides that the Governor of the State of Pennsylvania is to be *ex officio* president of the Board of Trustees.

(2) There is no provision in the charter that a professor may never be a trustee. As a matter of fact at least two trustees have been professors.

(3) The charter prescribes that the Provost and Deans must be chosen by the Board of Trustees from the Faculties.

(4) While removal from an office of instruction is nominally at the pleasure of the trustees—the only limitation prescribed by the charter requiring that a removal may not take place at the same meeting at which it is proposed—in the case of professors the trustees have passed by-laws which require that the professor shall receive in writing a statement of the charges which constitute the basis for the contemplated removal, and that he may reply to these charges in writing.

(5) Removals are effected every year by the faculties, and appointments usually take place only after consultation with and on recommendation of members of the faculty. I have never experienced in my department (psychology) the slightest suspicion of an attempt to scrutinize any appointment or removal recommended by my department and supported by the faculty to which my department belongs, excepting on the part of the Provost, who gives a very proper consideration to the merits of all persons recommended.

(6) In the case of the University of Pennsylvania the Nearing case constitutes a reaction on the part of the trustees, virtually a usurpation of a power which has tacitly, at least, hitherto resided in the faculty. This reaction has been manifested in an obvious way only within the last two years.

Excepting for these few details of perhaps a minor character, I am in entire accord with the tenor of your article.

LIGHTNER WITMER.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Continence vs. Contraception

SIR: No one interested in the subject of birth control could read the communication, "The Revolt of Wives," in your issue of June fifth, without sympathy and admiration. Sincerity and high courage vibrate in every sentence. Perhaps I should have carried my comment no further had I not just finished reading Mr. Graham Wallas' "The Great Society." But I was astonished at the emphasis the book laid on the communication's defects.

Throughout the entire article persists the ethical assumption that sexual intimacy has no true place except when accompanied by intent of conception. This assumption may or may not be ethically sound; THE NEW REPUBLIC has avoided that question and I have no wish either to affirm or deny the proposition. But it is from such an ethical assumption that the writer draws her physical and psychological inferences, and it is on these inferences that she bases her program. The error is obvious.

For instance, it is suggested that "parents are deliberately wasting substances which should go to the increase of their own bone, muscle, blood and brain, and to the like endowment of their children." Thus stated, this would seem to imply that every sexual act is by so much a subtraction from the individual's strength and can be justified only as a conscious sacrifice to the building of a new life. There may be medical opinion in support of this view—I have never heard of it. Certainly the support is far from unanimous. Mr. Wallas would probably say that, children or no children, complete sexual passivity produces a state of "baulked disposition" and a corresponding psychical derangement. We are told in another sentence that "the non-creativeness of sensuality is proved by the failure of offspring to make any substantial advance beyond parents as the generations pass." What sort of advance? Social? But there has been social advance. Then it must be advance in the sense of inherent superiority, purification of instincts. Again one refers to "The Great Society," where it is carefully argued that the "dispositions" or inherited impulses of men were determined by millions of years of jungle life and that within the historical era no hereditary transmission of acquired characteristics can be discerned. A mass of psychological opinion holds that the child begins where the parents began, not where they ended. Mere slight acquaintance with these theories prompts one to ask whether a few centuries of temperance could have changed the rate of the children's "advance" beyond their parents.

With a fine idealism and an impatient analysis the writer renounces all compromise and declares unconditionally for regulation by continence. Does that mean that if it actually took millions of years to establish our "natures," nothing is left but to devote the next few millions to disestablishment? But some of us are rather interested in the next few centuries. While we are beginning to reorganize our psychic selves we desire to mitigate soon the cruelty of huge families and their grim weight of poverty-stricken ignorance.

And would the compromise, if it is such, really retard an ultimate solution? Rather the contrary, one might suppose. For with the reduction of working-class families, the raising of material standards, the leveling of uncertainty, and the stimulation of varied interests, sex thought and sex life would receive a sane and enlightened attention hitherto undreamt.

JOHN LOWREY SIMPSON.

San Francisco, Cal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Musical Comedy Evolves

Ziegfeld Follies 1915, a musical comedy produced by F. Ziegfeld, Jr., staged by Julian Mitchell and Leon Errol, lines and lyrics by Channing Pollock, Rennold Wolf and Gene Buck, music by Louis Hirsch and David Stamper, and scenery painted by Joseph Urban of Vienna. Presented at the New Amsterdam Theatre, New York.

THE mingled excellence and banality of Mr. Ziegfeld's Follies hangs the unfortunate reviewer between heaven and earth. To damn it, to damn anything, would be a pleasure. To praise it unreservedly would be a boon. But pleasures and boons are not the lot of the critical species. Those ecstasies belong to nobler spheres.

A taste for musical comedy in general is a true attribute of natural man. A man in whom this taste is withered may be estimable and admirable, but so may a man without a nose. To possess one's nose is not always a privilege. There is much to be said against noses. But in spite of their unbecoming appearance, their exigent activity, we are habituated to noses. We miss them in their absence. And so it is with the taste for musical comedy. A man without it is a man not humanly complete.

Musical comedy, it must be admitted, is not associated with certain most superior beings. We do not associate it with Herbert Spencer, John Stuart Mill, George Washington, Marcus Aurelius. This is rather against it, but it would be a mistake to conclude too hastily that the instincts which are satisfied by musical comedy are therefore of a low or discreditable order. If it could be proved that when Herbert Spencer was "little Bertie Spencer" he never indulged in the exquisite pleasure of playing on a Jew's harp or a mouth organ, never made music on a comb, I should admit that the case against musical comedy was damaging. But I firmly believe that at some time even in that powerfully cerebral career there were needs which nothing but a mouth organ could assuage. And he who once has consummated that desire, or hid a brick in a package, or secretly practiced a clog dance, or blackened his face with charcoal, or tried on his father's hat, has shown the proclivities on which musical comedy depends. Marcus Aurelius must at some time have turned a handspring on the ancestral lawn. History does not say so, but it is wrong to infer from history, or from memorial sculpture or portraiture, that all great men stood throughout life in frozen attitudes. Most history is written in embalming fluid. It forgets that in the midst of death we are in life.

If, however, in spite of one's good hope, it should be shown that musical comedy meant nothing in the lives of the eminent reflective, the fact should not finally discredit them. They surely began with a capacity for that enjoyment. Had their lives been favored, they would have found themselves at home with Bert Williams, but various accidents, including the accident of time, diverted them, and they cannot be held accountable.

Granting, however, that musical comedy exists for the satisfaction of deep-rooted tastes, it no more follows that all musical comedies are satisfying than it follows that all apples are sweet. There are ravenous creatures, of course, whom nothing frustrates or upsets, who have the rude appetite and digestion of a pup. They consume musical comedy like an undergraduate. They do not understand having it criticized, and they instinctively regard the critic as puny and picayune. Against such gusto there is little to urge. If criticism seems, on one side, to be a proof of the sensitive and subtle and fine, it seems, on the other, the mere mark of a weak digestion, the sign of a fastidiousness that is sick. Such is the essential relativity of criticism. But no matter how strong may be the stomach of those who are easy to please, those who are hard to please manage to induce the delectable. They may be annoying but they force evolution to create.

Such at all events is one's conclusion from the Follies. Regardless of the complacent, Mr. Ziegfeld has in the first place introduced a set of scenery which would once have been considered too good for musical comedy but which now quite patently enhances its charm. Painted by Mr. Urban of Vienna, it has gaiety, decorative value and taste. Of the costuming the same is to be affirmed. In most musical shows the costumes are discordant and incongruous. There is little attempt to give them individual style; and above all there is no attempt to orchestrate them. But in the Follies they no longer impress one as do the advertising pages of the New York *American*. They are composed, so to speak, from the same fonts of type. That they are changed ten or fifteen times in the course of the evening does not happen to give one any personal pleasure. The restless lavishness of the production suggests effort rather than magical resource. But in view of imaginative poverty this wealth of ostentation is forgivable, and it was impressive as such vulgarity goes.

Besides the improvement in scenery and costume there were occasional acts that delighted the eye. There was, for example, the flirtation medley dance in which Miss Anna Pennington and Mr. George White participated. Rather broad in humor, it yet conveyed its intention without the customary diagrammatic explanations. And so Miss Ina Claire"s admirable satire of "Marie Odile." The conventional juggler found in Mr. W. C. Fields an antic acrobat whom one could observe without sickened apprehension, and Mr. Ed. Wynn's personal colloquy with characters on a motion-picture screen, to which those characters responded so humanly, had a novel and yet essential humor.

One of the best comedians in America is Mr. Bert Williams. It is rather unfortunate that on this occasion he should have several unsatisfactory turns. The skit on Granville Barker is thin, and the topical song on neutrality is even more lacking in point. As the hall boy of the Bunkem Court Apartments, however, Mr. Williams had a chance to show his art. Had the lines of that sketch one-tenth the salience of Mr. Williams's vocal or ambulatory lines, it would be irresistible. It is almost in spite of it that one appreciates the rich humanity, the knowledge of audience, the racial comedy and the racial charm of which Mr. Williams is master.

The banality of the Follies is partly evident in such graceless manoeuvers as those of the radium dance and such chromos as the Christmas Fantasy and Elysium. But it is worst in its topical references to Mr. Bryan, Mr. Sunday and the war. In the hands of a free and incisive critic, Mr. Bryan and Mr. Sunday would fit excellently into musical comedy, but the catering spirit is not one in which satire can be tried. As for the nationalism of the Follies, it is embarrassing and disgusting. Gilbert and Sullivan could carry off popular sentiment and satire, but Gilbert wrote for a homogeneous public from a witty personal point of view. The homogeneity of the New York public is one of rhythms and basic humor and newspaper and domestic familiarities. Outside that region the musical comedy will be inept—until some genius comes along who is able to make us kin.

FRANCIS HACKETT.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books and Things

EVEN the outsider, occasionally, is permitted to enjoy celebrities. Outsiders are the frame in which the masterpiece glows. One is asked to tea to meet Mr. Osric Pales, the poet, or one is included in a luncheon given for Professor Bean, the authority on the Near-East; but this is only a suggestion of the Real Thing. At the tea, in fact, one hardly meets Mr. Pales. A swaying figure in the center of a scrimmage, all one can do is to gaze upon him from an opposite wall and say to oneself, "So that is the famous Pales!" A protuberant forehead, perhaps, or a wayward lyric lock, or a mobile Adam's apple, are imprinted on one's sympathetic brain, but to get more of him it is necessary to use sharp elbows and to employ a piercing voice. Something similar is apt to happen at the luncheon to Bean. There is, to be sure, a fumbled handshake before luncheon, and the professor's filmy eye, blurred with all the other faces it has recently blotted up, tries vainly to fix your features. It entitles you to say, "I met Bean," but it is not a great deal to carry to the loved ones at home.

These casual encounters are not the real thing. Almost everybody has them. They may imply a taste for celebrities, but it is an amateurish ineffectual taste. The real way to cultivate celebrities is to go right after them, to bag them as one would bag beetles or butterflies. It is not, in sooth, the last word in intimacy. A collector of celebrities, like a collector of beetles, overlooks the principal charm of his object. A celebrity, like a beetle, is at his best in his natural environment. But the specialist's passion is not stilled by any such considerations as these. His taste is not a taste for the wisdom or beauty or power which the celebrated do incarnate. His is not a phase of the love of life. It is rather a taste for the labels with which the famous come decorated. Let other people seek to appreciate the personalities.

The glowing record of a great career in trapping London celebrities is given to the world by Mr. Douglas Sladen in a handsome volume entitled "Twenty Years of My Life." The biography of Mr. Sladen has an interest of its own. One learns with respect that his grandfather was John Baker Sladen, D.L., J.P., of Ripple Court, near Dover, and Etheldred St. Barbe; and one follows him sympathetically through Cheltenham and Oxford on his travels to America and Japan. But the fascination does not develop until one reaches the chapter, "We Start Our Literary At-Homes in London." From that point on the story has a relentless hold. "The Humorists at Our At-Homes," "The Poets at Our At-Homes," "Our At-Homes: Young Authors Who Are Now Great Authors"—one may easily guess their charm. But Mr. Sladen does not run dry so abruptly. "Lady Authors at Addison Mansions" are good for a chapter, and there are three chapters on Literary Clubs—the Authors', the Idlers, the Vagabonds, the Savage. "How I Wrote Who's Who" fills many pages, and there are innumerable pages on "My Novelist Friends," "Other Author Friends," "My Traveller Friends," "My Actor Friends," "My Artist Friends." An alluring but unsatisfactory section bears the heading, "Friends Who Never Came to Addison Mansions."

To understand Mr. Sladen's character as a fisher of friends it is necessary first of all to bare the shame of America: "I had graduated in a good school for entertaining at Boston and New York," he proclaims, "where the hostess takes care that each of her guests before they leave shall have been introduced to the person most worth meeting. If Oliver Wendell Holmes was in the room at Boston or the American Cambridge, every guest was presented to him. At a large literary at-home in New York you were sure to have been introduced to a Mark Twain, or a Howells, or a Stockton before you left. Americans make a point of having a guest of honor at an at-home, and I tried to keep this up as a feature of our at-homes at Addison Mansions."

There you have the ideal, and here you have its agent: "I was well known at authors' clubs and authors' receptions long before I was known as an author. In fact, I doubt if many of those who swarmed to our at-homes ever thought of me seriously as an author, or even realised that I wrote. They knew of me as the friend of authors, artists and actors, and people who were merely charming, and well enough off to entertain, and enjoyed meeting the celebrities of Bohemia. They credited me with a certain capacity as a host, who always introduced the right people to each other."

The celebrities of Bohemia! It is a phrase which, combined with proofs of Mr. Sladen's verve and assiduity, is warranted to exalt the lowest spirit. But to complete the picture one must glance at the lair of this benignant spider: "The hundreds of English and American authors, artists and actors who knew us at 32, Addison Mansions will recollect chiefly a very narrow hall hung with autographed portraits of celebrities, a room whose woodwork and draperies suggested one of the old Mameluke houses at Cairo, a room whose walls were covered with Japanese curios, and two other rooms, one of which was lined to the height of several feet from the ground with ingeniously-fitted-in book-cases, and the other was a bedroom in disguise. These and a ten by seven telephone room, likewise lined with book-shelves, which only had enough chairs for a tête-à-tête, formed the suite in which we held the weekly receptions in the American style at which so many people, now famous, used to meet every Friday night, regaled only with cigarettes, whiskeys-and-sodas, claret cup, bottled ale and sandwiches."

And now, in his sixtieth year, Mr. Sladen sits back to look over his trophies. "Hardy did come to 32 Addison Mansions. Hardy who has received the Order of Merit . . . I am very proud to have known Thomas Hardy; he is not only so great, but so silent and reserved, that it is not easy to know him. . . . It is natural to couple Hall Caine with Thomas Hardy, for both of them were brought up as architects, though they turned to literature, and reached the topmost rung. Hall Caine has been an intimate friend of mine for many years." "Lena Ashwell we have known better than any other great actress. . . . When she was only fourteen she spoiled a chicken she was cooking because she was so enthralled with reading 'King John.'"

Such is it to live in the heart of literary London, to have known "celebrities" and to have been "in constant intercourse with most of the best-known writers of the generation." One had imagined something more sensitive, perhaps, something more supercilious, in the dignified and reticent English race. But an illusion like this is based on English taunts at America. The celebrity-hunting of Mr. Sladen, in truth, is neither English nor American. It is, roughly speaking, human. It throve in London, as it would thrive in New York or Chicago, since everywhere there are persons who shine parasitically, persons who love to play the moon to any celebrity's sun.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Philosopher's Stone

Our Knowledge of the External World as a Field for Scientific Method in Philosophy, by Bertrand Russell. Chicago: The Open Court Publishing Co. $2.00 net.

MR. RUSSELL'S visit to this country last year did not attract as much attention from the general educated public as did the previous visits of Bergson or Eucken. Yet there can be no questioning of the fact that American philosophy is far more indebted to Russell than to either of the more widely known men. Not only have our young neo-realists been dependent upon him for inspiration and substantial arguments, but the center of interests and the prevailing standards of philosophic workmanship have been largely influenced by his work. Certainly no one acquainted with recent philosophic literature will disagree with the judgment of such independent thinkers as Professors Dewey, Adler, Woodbridge, Thorndike and Bush, who recommended that the Butler medal be conferred upon him "for the most important contribution to philosophy in the last five years." But though Mr. Russell writes with unusual clarity and with a nobility of style that is remarkable, he is not likely ever to become popular. He brings no kindly message to the common man. Most people who ask advice really crave confirmation, and certainly the great majority come to philosophy not to learn new truths, but to find support for such cherished beliefs as immortality, progress and the like. Mr. Russell, however, does not conceive it to be the duty of philosophy to serve merely as an aid to bolster up theologic or other comforting certainties. Scientific philosophy must devote itself entirely to the attainment of demonstrable or verifiable truth. This may sound like a thin platitude. Of course philosophy must seek the truth. Who doubts it? In point of fact, however, the love of truth for its own sake *is* very rare, and perhaps becoming rarer in this hasty utilitarian age. Even if we disregard the unripe and seedless wisdom of those who deny the very existence of truth or the possibility of our being interested in any truth that is not of some practical use, it is certainly a fact that the prevailing tendency to-day subordinates pure science to its practical application, and philosophic truth to social or spiritual edification. Hence it will come as a shock to many readers to find that Mr. Russell claims for philosophy the right of ethical neutrality. The philosopher ought no more to be called on to justify the ethical or social importance of his propositions than the mathematician or physicist should be called on to justify the ethical importance of equations or atoms. Indeed, astronomy became a true science only when it lost its main human interest by giving up its astrologic pretension to foretell the outcome of human ventures, and restricted itself to such apparently unimportant and neutral facts as that the paths of the planets could be expressed in mathematical relations.

The importance of thus taking the scientific motive seriously is seen in Mr. Russell's attitude to the dominant types of philosophy of to-day, the classical and the evolutionary. The classical tradition, according to Mr. Russell, has its roots in the Greek unquestioning confidence in the power of deductive reason—due to the triumphs of geometry—and the medieval assumption that the world is an essentially tidy affair. Mr. Russell recognizes the great value of the classical systems of philosophy as aids to the imagination. As claimants of truth they not only contradict each other but make glib generalizations with regard to the totality of things that certainly go beyond our limited stock of verifiable knowledge. At any rate most of these generalizations are as to matters of fact which are or ought to be the objects of special sciences. The peculiar problems of philosophy relate to certain more general and abstract issues for which logic is the organon. (The logic of Mr. Russell is not only analytic but also synthetic—liberating the imagination as to what the world *may be*, though refusing "to legislate as to what the world is"—p. 8.)

The word evolution has acquired such a potency that the mere fact that certain philosophies like those of Spencer or Bergson use it causes them to be regarded as scientific. But as a few drops of holy water cannot transform a sinner into a saint, so a few empirical generalizations and technical terms cannot transform mythologic pictures of the universe into genuine science. The scientific spirit, like the spirit of sanctity, can be acquired only by the arduous methodical discipline. It requires a chaste self-control in the presence of tempting hypothesis and alluring generalizations that would ensnare the scientific Ulysses into a voluptuous rest. Is this true of the evolutionist philosophies, with their easy, sweeping generalizations about the totality of things based on a few inaccurately reported facts? If we look closely we can see beneath the scientific cosmetics the old shrew Theology. Instead of Providence we have the old struggle for existence, the social organism or the *èlan vital;* instead of the far-off divine event we have the goal of progress; instead of the triumph of the will of God we have the survival of the fittest, etc., but the substance is the same, an elaborate system of apologetics for the powers that be.

Scientific method in philosophy, according to Russell, is not some esoteric procedure but simply a method of ordinary knowledge rendered as critically careful as possible. We start with common knowledge, "vague, complex and inexact as it always is," yet in some sense true, and we advance by analyzing our question, finding its precise meaning, what kind of an answer it calls for, and trying to construct the required solution from the available or possible material. Hence readers who take up this volume expecting to find new, secret, or mystic knowledge with regard to the external world will be disappointed. But the patient reader will be amply rewarded by learning that such concepts as continuity, infinity and causality need no longer serve as objects of gaping awe or intellectual violence. By the aid of modern mathematics philosophy has solved the infinite as definitely as the general quadratic equation has been solved.

As an ardent worshipper of Mr. Russell's "Principles of Mathematics," I confess that my faith is sorely tried by those parts of the book which deal with the relation of sense to physics. There seems to me here too much concession to the Kantian psychology, whereas the intellectual or Platonic realism which Mr. Russell rediscovered for the modern world renders the whole epistemologic problem unnecessary. Mr. Russell, however, does not claim finality for his results (except in the arguments concerning continuity and infinity). The method alone is offered as a permanent contribution. Like other scientific contributions, it is in the nature of the case not something brand new but a carrying to a higher point that which others have done. Thus Mr. Russell's method contains elements of the Platonic dialectic, the Aristotelian method of definition, and the method of presupposition which Kant calls transcendental. The method has been in great part embodied by March, Poincaré, and by Mr. Russell's collaborator, Mr. Whitehead, in a wonderful memoir on "The Concepts of the Material Universe." The latter, however, being written in the terse and elegant language of Peanese

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

symbolism, has remained an inaudible music. Even the mathematical physicists who have most to learn from it have allowed it to remain buried in the Transactions of the Royal Society.

By insisting on the scientific spirit in philosophy Mr. Russell, of course, abandons the problems that have a wider human appeal. The need for some imaginative picture of the universe, some plan or scheme of things entire, seems too fundamental a human need to be ruled out of court. And if scientific knowledge is not adequate, why not rely on faith, intuition, etc.? Here, however, Mr. Russell is at his best. Without pretending to be able to deny that by intention or mystic experience we may guess or in some way attain insight, he points out that so long as such insight is untested and unsupported it carries no guarantee of its truth. It is most important, however, that we keep the currents of our intellectual life clean and undefiled. Impatience with the painfully slow progress of science, and a too eager desire for immediate visible results, makes philosophy an easy prey to get-rich-quick schemes and other romantic ways of avoiding the laborious and monstrous routine that scientific work involves. But the hunters after the philosopher's stone, after magical formulae to solve the riddles of the universe so that we shall live happy for ever afterwards, like the circle-squarers and the purveyors of physical and social panaceas, exhaust themselves in vain. We cannot all win the first prize. It is better, then, to make the great renunciation, that omnipotence and omniscience is not ours. If such renunciation does not seem heroic it at least saves us from being ridiculous.

Mr. Russell's emphasis on the narrower and soluble problems of philosophy does not, of course, mean an insensibility to the more poignant problems of human existence. On the contrary, few men seem to me to have so justly dealt with the problem of conscious personal existence from the modern standpoint. But precisely because of Mr. Russell's belief in the transcendent importance of intellectual honesty, he is so clear-headed in rejecting the petty ointments by which quacks pretend to cure the mortal ills of finitude.

MORRIS R. COHEN.

The Big Battalions

The Elements of the Great War. The First Phase, by Hilaire Belloc. New York: Hearst's International Library Co. $1.50.

NO one can read this book of Hilaire Belloc without losing certain romantic illusions about the chances of war. We are prone to regard war as a lottery, whereas in point of fact it is an applied science. We are inclined to ascribe victories to the genius of a Marlborough, a Frederick, a Napoleon, to the righteousness of a cause, to a host of other idealistic elements. All these have their influence, especially in so far as they affect the morale of troops and the enthusiasm and self-sacrifice of the home population. In the main, however, the battle is to the strong, and the strong is the nation with great material resources, a favorable geographical position, and the capacity to pour a huge weight of metal and an overwhelming number of trained men upon a wide battle line. The large army crushes the small army. The heavy line breaks through the light line. God fights on the side of the big battalions.

Especially in very recent times does this overweight of men and metal decide wars. The technical processes which have revolutionized industry and society, count on the whole to the advantage of the large, wealthy military population. In other words, modern economic, technological and military developments increasingly favor the nation with deep material resources. Against such overweight, personal valor counts for nothing.

TIFFANY & CO.

THE MAIL SERVICE OFFERS SATISFACTORY FACILITIES TO THOSE WHO CANNOT PLACE THEIR ORDERS IN PERSON

FIFTH AVENUE AND 37TH STREET
NEW YORK

It is from some such ground as this that we must study Hilaire Belloc's "Elements of the Great War." It is an analysis of the factors of strength of the two great coalitions which found themselves opposed last August, and is an account of the progress of the war up to, but not including, the battle of the Marne. It is a bird's-eye view, a highly generalized and simplified presentation.

As we view the war through Mr. Belloc's eyes we see that in the beginning the Germanic allies had a great superiority in men, an enormous superiority in munitions, a far better general preparedness, a favorable geographical position, and on the whole a more intelligent appreciation of many of the problems of modern warfare and a more exact sense of how those problems were to be solved. Mr. Belloc estimates that at the very beginning of the war the German-Austrian forces on the East almost equaled the Russian, while on the West the Germans had a superiority of over 100 per cent and an effective superiority of 60 per cent or 70 per cent. He believes that the preponderance of the Germans in munitions was even greater, due to the fact that *"he* (the enemy) *made war at his own chosen moment, after three years of determined and largely secret preparation."* (Mr. Belloc's italics.) The geographical situation of Germany and Austria was equally an advantage. These two empires represent a huge territory in the very center of Europe, and separate Russia

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

almost completely from England and France. They fight on inside lines. Moreover, they have points of contact with so many neutral nations—Switzerland, Holland, Denmark, Sweden and Norway, Rumania, and until lately Italy—that a complete blockade is difficult. The Germanic Powers also have the advantage of a measure of racial unity and of common historical traditions. Communication is easy, and troops may be rapidly shifted from Flanders to Galicia or from Poland to Belgium as occasion arises. Finally the Germanic allies had held what on the whole was a correct theory of many military details. They recognized the fact that permanent fortifications were useless against modern high explosives fired from howitzers, and at Namur they demolished the French defenses within a few hours. Had the Allies been beaten at the Marne, the fortifications of Paris would have fallen almost as rapidly as did those of Antwerp.

But the Allies did not lose on the Marne, and it is the strategy that won this battle which not only makes up the greater part of Belloc's book, but proves to his mind that the French general theory of strategics was an admirable one and adapted to the problem of meeting superior enemy forces and defeating them in detail.

According to Mr. Belloc, the preponderance of the German allies in men and munitions during the first weeks of the war and up to October, 1914, was so enormous, that "it is no wonder that he [the enemy] confidently expected a complete victory before the winter and the signing of peace before the end of the year." In the second period of the war, viz., about April 15 to June 1, 1915, the Germanic empires had a considerably reduced superiority, despite their enormous wastage. As for the third period which is now beginning, Mr. Belloc seems to indicate the gradual passing of superiority both in men and munitions to the Allies, through an increase in the British and Russian armies, and the industrial mobilization for military purposes of the world outside of Germany and Austria. The balance slowly turns.

Whether this will happen depends of course upon many things which Mr. Belloc cannot know and upon other things which he asserts but does not prove. All through the book Mr. Belloc makes statements without seeking to establish their truth. He speaks of an enormous wastage of the German forces, for which he adduces no sort of evidence, and he informs us quite dogmatically that the German preparations for this war began in July, 1911, but leaves this assertion quite unsupported. As a consequence, though we feel that the book is brilliant and illuminating, we are quite in the dark as to whether the facts upon which Mr. Belloc's theses are based are indeed facts or mere imaginative excursions. If it were not for this incertitude concerning his data and a rather uncomfortable feeling produced by his parade of naked prejudices, we should accord to his book an unqualified recommendation.

A Doctor on Birth Control

Limitation of Offspring, by William J. Robinson, M.D. New York: The Critic and Guide Co. $1.00.

A VERY good test of the rank of any civilization is what people hold to be right, but an even better test is what they hold not to be wrong. Among us, for example, it is a crime to hurt children's bodies through corporal punishment, but it is not a crime to hurt their minds through movies of Charlie Chaplin. It is a crime for boys and girls to play in a public schoolground during vacation, but it is not a crime for adults to chatter and fidget in a public concert hall during a performance of *L'Apprenti Sorcier* or of *Tod und Verklärung*. It is a crime to put to death a decrepit centenarian, an incurable wastrel, or a pain-racked body pleading for release, but it is not a crime to bring into life a rickety, imbecile, degenerate, or infected child.

This moral topsy-turveydom of ours yields fine picking to a Gilbertian wit. But, what is far more important, it sometimes inspires able and imaginative men to become pioneers in setting our rights to wrongs, or our wrongs to rights. Now in a civilization with guilty secrets beneath its professed morality, it is more dangerous to prove that a supposed wrong is right, than that a supposed right is wrong—as in the savagely received Ibsen's "Ghosts." Dr. Robinson has chosen the harder pioneering task of the two. For twenty years he has preached the truth about the control of offspring, and has declared this practice, hitherto regarded as infamous, to be right as well as necessary. During all this time his message, however varied in color or embroidery, has had a single trip-hammer refrain. A society that watches anxiously over man's exit from life should watch at least as anxiously over his entrance into life; if death is regulated by a coroner and an autopsy, birth should be regulated by forethought and a contraceptive.

One might almost take these things to be self-evident. But there are many people who cannot or will not think them so. The forces of greed profit by the unlimited production of children, no matter how inferior the quality of the supply. And the forces of sanctimony and dulness are indifferent or unimpressed when science explains that large families mean exhausted mothers, feeble offspring, and a high infant mortality; that ignorance of contraception leads husbands to resort to prostitutes and wives to submit to abortion; and that the law forbidding the truth about preventives to be told is responsible directly for syphilitic, cretinous, and insane children, and indirectly for diseases, perversions, and crimes without number.

Pious, well-meaning people are horrified at the artificial sterilization of marriage. But what is the sterilization of marriage compared to the terrorization of marriage through the fear of pregnancy? Doctor Robinson's wide professional experience leads him to conclude that ninety marriages out of a hundred are haunted and hunted by the specter of a child that the mother doesn't want and the father can't support. Yet, cruel as is the plight of the unwillingly pregnant mother or of the economically tortured father, the case for the regulation of conception rests most stably on the rights of children. It is important that no accidental child shall be forced upon parents. It is even more important that no accidental parents shall be forced upon a child. The fundamental right of every child is its right to be desired, its right to be born into a friendly environment.

Doctor Robinson gives the problem a clear, unvarnished, and thoroughgoing treatment. He pitches into the social and medical implications of the prevention of conception, furnishes the practice with a scientific basis, exposes the diabolic character of the law that suppresses contraceptive information, and gives the bugaboos supporting the law no quarter. The book punctures every objection to birth control that credulity and stupidity have been able to advance. This is saying a good deal. But it is not saying too much for an author who loads truth with power, and fights for that actively civilized society which, as Havelock Ellis tells us, "should hold in its hands not only the Key of Death but also the Key of Birth."

FELIX GRENDON.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New
REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

Taking Care of Belgium

How food and clothing are being distributed to seven million people

MABEL HYDE KITTREDGE

SATURDAY, JULY 31st, 1915
PART II

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FOREWORD

A PARTIAL account follows here of how seven million people have been saved from famine and destruction. For Belgium still exists, not merely as the dream of scattered refugees, but as a nation, living on its own territory, with its economic existence shaken but not destroyed. As Miss Kittredge shows, the Commission for Relief in Belgium has done something more than establish bread lines and soup kitchens. It has kept money in circulation, stirred a certain amount of industry into life, and enlisted the ability of the Belgian people in concrete and important tasks. Perhaps in the end it will be felt that the greatest work of the Commission, after the actual saving of life, has been the preservation of Belgian executive capacity, the turning of the thoughts of Belgian leaders from empty hopelessness to the organization of their people. If those abilities are saved, the future of Belgium is not altogether desperate. If Belgium can be conserved against the historic futility and despair of conquered peoples, if its energy can remain concrete and wilful, no power can entirely extinguish its national life.

Americans have played a large part in this work, and by their deeds they have given a new significance to neutrality. The word has seemed at times to denote a cold and irresponsible detachment. But men like Mr. Hoover, Mr. Lindon Bates, and Mr. Brand Whitlock, and other honored men whose names are not so well known, have given neutrality a rich background, have made the word synonymous not with isolation, but with the protection of peaceful life. We fancy that the Belgian people do not regard American neutrality as mere impotence. To them it must mean the force which has preserved their existence. For the Commission has endowed neutrality with organization, with power, with practical service.

The Commission is a government, with a flag, with a merchant marine, with virtual police power. It deals as a neutral state with the chancellories of the world. It is a business plant which affects the markets of two continents. It is a voluntary organization, international in scope, and international in spirit. It transacts business across the barricaded frontiers, and by the sheer importance and skill of its effort it has compelled the warring empires to cooperate with it. The men of that Commission have built a bridge from England to Germany, and guarded its approaches by their tact.

There is no armed force behind them. Their power has been fact—the fact that human beings were starving. Their influence has been based on a compelling recognition that no military necessity is great enough to permit the destruction of seven million people. Their spiritual quality has been their appeal to concrete acts, to ingenious organization, to the doing of necessary things. They have indulged in no highflown talk. There has been among them no politician's foozling. The work was conceived by an engineer, and carried through with that clean and direct spirit which is the gift of service to the world. That the leaders of the work have been Americans may well make us proud.

It is not good will which distinguishes this Commission. There has been plenty of that all through history. It is the fact that scientific organization has been made the servant of good will. The significance of that is like a kindly light on the battlefields of Europe. We have admired the organization of war, its supreme technical efficiency. Here is an organization created out of nothing over night by democrats, and its efficiency yields no point to the best disciplined institutions of the world. The larger message of the Belgian Relief Commission is that democracies have within them resources of ability which in our despondency we have attributed to autocracies alone. There is hope for freedom when such capacity is at its disposal.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Taking Care of Belgium

THE full history of the relief work in Belgium has never been written, and it cannot be written until the war is over. It is easy to see the many reasons for this. In the first place, those who are doing the actual work are too busy to stop and write down their experiences. Moreover, a work so large must be viewed from a distance in order to be seen as a whole. The events now are too recent, the details too pressing and imminent, for anyone to get more than a passing view.

Largest Commissary Work of History

The Commission for Relief in Belgium is the biggest commissary undertaking the world has ever seen. It feeds seven million people with foodstuffs drawn from collection-centers from three to eight thousand miles distant from the point of distribution. When we realize not only that the workers represent a hundred thousand volunteer laborers, but that the members of the organization include some of the ablest business and financial men in the world, that five governments are concerned and nearly every country is making its contribution, it is not surprising that we have had only glimpses here and there of so vast a business.

Another reason why those most interested and possessed of the clearest knowledge of this great commissary undertaking do not talk, is because, as Mr. Lindon Bates has written, "the keystone of the arch of the Commission for Relief in Belgium is neutrality." Mr. Herbert C. Hoover, who in October, 1914, was made chairman of the Belgium Relief work, said, "It is a duty that we owe to the people of Belgium that the Commission should remain neutral in word as well as in deed." The instructions to the Rhodes students who volunteered their services in Belgium were as follows:

"In your daily service remember that you have not only a service to render to these people, but that you have a duty to this Commission, and above all you have a duty to your own country. You must forget that the greatest war in history is being waged; you have no interest in it other than the feeding of the Belgian people. You must school yourselves to a realization that you have, to us and to your country, a sacred obligation of absolute neutrality in every word and every deed. Remember that when this war is over the thing that will stand out will not be the number of dead and wounded, but the record of those efforts that went to save life." And they might have added—"only your small part in this great work is your concern."

Beginning the Organization

The history, incomplete though it is, of how the world came to undertake to feed the people of Belgium is well known: how the first call came from Liège to Rotterdam for two tons of salt for fifty thousand persons, and how that salt reached Liège thirty hours after the request; how, on October twenty-sixth, Brand Whitlock, the American Minister, reported that nearly seven millions of the inhabitants of Belgium were facing famine; how, almost on the same date, Mr. Hoover, who had been drawn into the relief work of assisting Americans to leave England at the beginning of the war, sent out a call which ended: "This situation affects the wealthy and the poor of Belgium; it touches every home; it is a question of feeding an entire population." And at the same time came the call from King Albert of Belgium, asking America to help relieve the distress of his people.

On November first the first consignment of food from America arrived in Rotterdam. As one writer has stated, those who want a stirring tale have only to read the Commission's narrative of the arrival of that first boat; how it got to Rotterdam on a Sunday morning, when the Dutch government made an exception to the rigid rule against working on Sunday, and allowed five hundred stevedores to leap aboard before the ship was even made fast, and how they broke all records of the port by the speed of their unloading. This was on November first, and by November seventh four hundred thousand meals a day were being issued in Brussels alone, at the price of a penny a meal, and by the twenty-second the daily number was half as much again. Almost at once was created the perfect organization that we see now operating in America, England, Holland and Belgium.

Spain's part in the work of distribution is too little realized outside of Belgium. From the beginning the Spanish Minister has worked side by side with the American, and indeed the two are the only foreign Ministers now resident in Brussels. The Spanish and the American Commissions are the two neutral partners of the Commission for Relief. The other partner is Belgium itself, in the guise of the Comité National de Secours d'Alimentation. Every country of the world has sent aid, but the work of distributing this aid is the Commission's work. It is the Comité National—the Belgians themselves—who have entire charge of the actual distribution of food and clothing.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Getting Supplies to the Border

The intricacies of the diplomatic and political arrangement necessary before so delicate a task could be undertaken as to feed a people in a country surrounded by belligerent nations, a country in the possession of one of these nations, where the troops must be constantly marching through the territory, is a subject beyond the present writer's power of description. Every ship bearing relief commission cargoes, as well as every freight car, carries a large square of white cotton cloth bearing the words: "The Commission for Relief in Belgium." There are between a hundred and forty and a hundred and fifty ships. These are allowed by the British, French and German admiralties safe conduct to Rotterdam from various ports in the United States as well as other countries.

For the safety of these relief ships three forms are necessary to be filled out before the ship is permitted to leave a port. Form one is addressed to the German Consul, and is signed by the vice-chairman of the Commission for Relief in Belgium. It certifies that the cargo of the ship is to be dispatched to Rotterdam under the auspices of the Commission, that the cargo is made up of food stuffs, and that the entire cargo is intended for the civilian population of Belgium. This paper does not bar a search of the vessel, and the cargo is so stowed that the search may be conducted quickly and easily. The Commission agrees to notify the German Ambassador at Washington by telegraph of the date of departure of all ships leaving any port; also to notify the German Ambassador at The Hague when the ship is rechartered by the Commission for a return voyage. Form two is a certificate from the captain of the vessel addressed to the German Ambassador at Washington. The Captain pledges his word to abstain from all action on both outgoing and homecoming voyages involving assistance to any government at war. Form three is a telegram confirmed by a letter from the vice-chairman of the Commission to the German Ambassador at Washington, certifying that the entire cargo consists of food and clothing designed for the relief of non-combatants in Belgium.

Members of the Commission are granted immediate audience with the cabinet ministers of Europe, and the German military authorities issue special passes allowing members and agents of the Commission the right of free movement in Belgium. To no other institution or individual is this privilege granted, and it is granted on the simple word of honor of the executive members of the Commission.

The arrival of one of the Commission's relief ships at Falmouth is telegraphed to the Rotterdam office of the Commission, and when the ship reaches Dover she takes on a pilot who conducts her safely to Flushing and thence to Rotterdam. At the frontier the Dutch seal is removed and a seal of the Commission for Relief in Belgium substituted. All ships unload at Rotterdam. The arrival of a ship having been announced, floating elevators are sent along either side the moment she has dropped anchor in the lower port. Outside of these floating elevators are three hundred lighters or barges. These barges are to carry the wheat or food stuffs by canal to their destinations in Belgium. An accurate account is kept of each barge, or car—a few freight cars are used in the eastern part—as it passes the various stations. The speed with which this work is done is ahead of all records. A nine-thousand ton ship loaded with wheat can be emptied in thirty-six hours on three hundred barges, which are immediately towed by tugs through the canals into Belgium. The Dutch government furnishes all facilities for unloading these ships. Holland even at one time loaned the Commission ten thousand tons of food, when the immediate need of food was imminent and it could not be sent from America in time. The fact that seventy ships have been chartered by the Commission to sail from fourteen American ports, is a matter known to every interested American. But the details connected with that food after it reaches Belgium are to many more or less of a closed book, not because there is any secret about it—for, as was written in one instance, "Every office, every desk and every book is open to all people and all governments"—but because neither people nor items of news now travel from that country with any facility.

Difficulties of Transport Through Belgium

In this free country of telephones and easy travel we sometimes forget the difficulties with which the work of feeding 7,000,000 is carried on in a country surrounded with the armies of five nations, which has no telephone or telegraph for communication either within its own borders or with the outside world, where the postoffice system has practically ceased to exist, where no Belgian man or woman is allowed to travel more than five miles from his own home, and where all rail and road routes are used by the military. The canals are the only means of transporting the food from Holland into the different provinces of Belgium. The representatives of the Commission who had to map out and explore the entire canal route were much hampered in their work, inasmuch as many of the canals were destroyed and others were obstructed.

There are in Belgium one hundred and twenty principal warehouses to which food is shipped from Rotterdam. From these it is reshipped to small detailed districts or communes, there being in Belgium 32,000 communal centers. When it is neces-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sary, which is often the case, for the German government to close the border between Holland and Belgium for the transfer of troops, it announces this fact to the Commission, and then the warehouses are piled high with food, which must last until communication with Holland is reopened.

Belgians Themselves the Main Helpers

The main purchasing fund, the greatest and the sacredest of all the donations, comes from the Belgians themselves. Into this treasury has been put all that the enveloped Belgian race could gather of the remnants of their shattered fortunes. It registers their struggle for survival. Although the Commission purchases food from funds sent from all over the world, it looks upon this trust fund from the Belgians as the foundation of its work.

One often hears statements that make it appear as if the greater part of the population of Belgium were either killed or had left their country at the time it was taken possession of by the Germans. This, however, is only because nearly one million refugees fleeing from a country at one time makes a great impression upon the world. There were in Belgium in October last about 7,800,000 people, and there now remain a little less than 7,000,000. It would be a great advantage to the Belgian nation if many of the refugees would return, and it will be, I believe, a blot on Belgium's wonderful history at this time, that the well-to-do citizens do not all take their stand with those who are making such a mighty effort to hold their nation together.

A few instances of the spirit that impels the Belgian to "stand by his job" come before me. I see the little shop on the Victoria Boulevard in Brussels, with a line of white waists hanging in a very clean window, but with no customers going in and out. When I went inside, the owner appeared from the back room, not with that air of being ready that we are so used to in our shopkeepers, but with the attitude of not having been disturbed in a long time. She explained that for months her shop had been closed and the blinds pulled down; and then she added, in that dull, lifeless tone that one grows accustomed to in Belgium, "I thought it was better to open the doors, pull up the blinds and look as if business were going on, because it seems to make the day seem nearer when all shops will be open, when our King and Queen will come back, and the people will dance in the streets and make a great noise." This last sentence, uttered in the deadly stillness of that street, seemed to express a vision almost more than human. This same spirit was shown in a large shampooing establishment on another fashionable boulevard. All the men whom one expects to see ready for work were missing. The lines of basins, the marble slabs, the many shampoo preparations were all there, but the only person in sight was the owner of the store, a man too old to fight. He announced in that same unemotional voice, "I don't go out, I can't bear the stillness of the streets. I'll just stay here and work until the war is over."

The hotels, with their half dozen guests instead of their hundreds, are still open. The waiters stand at the tables ready to serve, the porters wait behind their desks; the telephones are cut off, there is no mail in the little postoffice boxes. But these brave people are giving all they can to their land when they follow their King's advice: "There are but two places for my people now—in the ranks or in their own country."

How the Comité Works

The actual distribution of food, as has been said, is in the hands of the Comité National de Secours d'Alimentation. This committee was created by the principal business men of Belgium, representing the nine provinces. The head office is in Brussels, and sub-committees work in each one of the provinces. Thursday is the great day in Belgium; every Thursday morning there come to Brussels nine automobiles from the nine provinces. Automobiles are now used in Belgium only by the German officers, the American Minister and the Commission for Relief in Belgium. The noise of one in those still streets is more of an event than the rush of a fire engine in a small town. They carry the delegates of the National Committee of Relief to the Thursday meeting in Brussels. In each car are three Belgian delegates and one American, for everywhere food goes there must be an American representative. They leave their province at dawn in order that the Commission's mail may catch the courier, who leaves Brussels for Rotterdam twice a week at nine in the morning. These men are the pick of Belgium. They discuss in this council means to insure the life of the country, such topics as how to get potatoes to the extreme west of their land, the warning that no corn is to be given under any circumstances into the hands of distillers, the apportionment of clothing, the arrival of provisions at Rotterdam during the preceding week, and the cargoes that are expected during the coming week. All such questions—how to take care of refugees coming from France, how to provide work for the destitute, how to protect the little children—are taken up.

Each delegate must report the entire population and the number of people to be fed in his district, the amount of flour which the town or commune receives each week, and the number of persons not receiving bread or flour from the town. He must also report such minute details as the weight of

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

each loaf of bread distributed. He must see that the bakers strictly observe their contract; these bakers can work for no one but the town to which they are assigned, and they must have in their possession no flour except that furnished by the Commission. This work is so carefully supervised that it is impossible for any speculation or fraud on the part of the bakers or the millers to be perpetrated.

In the case of large centers like Brussels there is superimposed a municipal government. The communes, however, maintain their autonomy in local matters. The machinery of the communes which existed before the war has been utilized as far as possible, but in most cases volunteer workers have been substituted for paid workers. Practically all the well-to-do Belgians now in Belgium are contributing some service. The local grocery stores of the different communes are used as food centers, for, apart from hothouse grapes and similar luxuries for which there is now no chance of export, these stores have almost no food to sell except what they obtain from the Commission. The exact population of each of the nine provinces is known to the Commission, and each one of the provinces gets its proportionate share of every shipload. Unfortunately there are still parts of the western provinces in the war or operating zone that cannot be reached.

When the wheat reaches its destination in Belgium it is delivered by employees of the Commission from the barges to mills. Most scrupulous care is taken not only that every pound of wheat sent from Rotterdam shall reach its destination, but that when wheat is turned into the mill from the barge the miller shall render account of an equivalent quantity of flour, allowing 7 per cent for bran. This bran is the miller's pay for grinding the wheat. He is also allowed twenty-five cents for every 225 pounds of wheat. In each province there are from six to ten of these large mills, grinding only the Commission's flour. The lowliest man in Belgium is more anxious than any German, English or American to play his part well. To arouse distrust in this complicated business might mean that he and his family again must face starvation.

The woman in America who buys her six or seven loaves of bread a day has no idea of the tremendous business of the breadmaking industry in Belgium. In the first place the very action of buying thousands of tons of wheat affects the market price so acutely that it reaches every man and woman in the civilized world. It is not an easy thing to buy the wheat to make bread for seven millions of people. If the business end of it is not properly attended to it will lead to terrible disaster; it must be gone about very cautiously, and by men who possess a hard-won knowledge of the temper of one of the most capricious markets of the world. After the wheat reaches Belgium and is ground, the flour is sold to the bakers of the various districts; but each baker is allowed to bake only the amount indicated and desired by the communal officer of his district. The bread is purchased from the baker by and delivered directly to the local committee before ten o'clock each morning, and they sell it to the well-to-do at a profit, to the middle classes at cost price, while the destitute receive it for nothing. The tax paid by the well-to-do, together with the elimination of the middleman and the use of volunteer labor, makes the price in Belgium 10 per cent under the price of bread in London. In many provinces it is possible to buy a book of coupons like a railroad mileage-book, and these can be exchanged at a baker's. In other places bread bonds are sold.

The Question of Money

The greatest problem the Commission has had to meet is the matter of currency. Immediately upon the occupation of Brussels by the German troops a sudden halt was called in the economic life. Factories and workshops shut down, and thousands were thrown out of employment. Metallic currency disappeared, and national bank notes were so scarce that those who still had resources began to pay for food in paper money. Many communes were printing paper issues of their own. There was an abundance of this paper, but it had no value. A great banking and trading institution was recognized as an absolute necessity if the feeding problem was to be more than mere charity. From the beginning the Commission has stood for an organization to help the Belgians help themselves. All people who were able wished to pay for their food, and every means to make this possible has been used.

The only way to do it was to restore the value of paper money in Belgium. The Commission therefore announced that it would accept all issues of paper money in payment for food. This at once restored the whole paper currency to its full value. The next step was to negotiate with the belligerent governments for permission to let the Commission collect foreign debts to Belgium in gold, and pay the creditors in paper. After long negotiations the nations agreed to this, and there was then set up a form of exchange which is now the life-blood of the Commission.

By degrees this exchange system has been extended; the Commission has persuaded many well-to-do Belgians to pledge their credit for monies which are handed over to the Commission in gold and which the Belgians then accept from the Commission in paper. The Commission has also advanced money to communal governments taking their obligation therefor, and by pledging security for these obligations has obtained money with

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

which to carry on the work. Many Belgian concerns which had resources abroad had exhausted their local resources, and so were obliged to discharge their workmen. The Commission realized that this was forcing employer and employees into the bread line. In such cases the Belgian concerns handed over in London and in New York funds they possessed abroad, and accepted from the Commission Belgian paper money received from the sale of food. Thus the cycle of credit was reëstablished, concerns were again able to employ labor, and thousands were saved from the bread line.

To-day the Commission is the only institution which is doing a systematic banking business across enemy lines. The communes have been enabled because of this restoration of currency to pay communal officers, to maintain the schools, and to keep up municipal works. Also a portion of the cost of feeding the destitute is carried by the communes themselves. Because of this exchange system and the fact that capital has been used again and again, it is estimated that the $10,000,000 contributed by the Belgians together with at least an equal amount contributed by outside nations has imported into Belgium food worth at least $65,000,000. Every dollar is used for the purchase of food and not for transportation. A transportation fund with a nucleus of $3,000,000 has been made available by Belgian bankers.

The Bread Line and Soup Kitchen

While the Commission was organizing the banking system and arranging for the import of foodstuffs, the Belgians themselves were creating the most extensive and perfect system for the preparation and distribution of this food. The work is entirely in their hands, excepting for the American representatives.

The people of Belgium are divided into different classes. There are the well-to-do, who have enough to buy food and to pay as well the tax or profit. The working people of small means pay the actual cost only; $1.80 a month is sufficient to pay for eight ounces of bread, one and a half pints of soup, and a small amount of coffee each day—enough to keep one human being alive. Each destitute person becomes the subject of special investigation by the communal officers, and if the case warrants he is given a free, non-transferable ticket. On it is indicated the amount of food he can receive. This ticket is presented each day by the head of the family, who must have it punched by an officer before receiving his supply of food. Every month each family is revisited, because the conditions are liable to change from day to day. Each enrolled person receives the same amount of food as those who can afford to pay cost price—one and a half pints of soup and eight ounces of bread. Those who pay the actual food-cost must receive tickets and have their card punched in like manner as the destitute. The communes pay to the National Committee sixty cents a month on every ticket issued, whether free or paid for. This is to guarantee economy in issuing free tickets. On February tenth it was estimated that if those waiting in line for soup stood single file the line would be six hundred miles long.

Another class is children under three years of age. For these there are special distribution centers. Each child is examined by a communal doctor, and receives one of five kinds of tickets, depending on the age and health of the child. The portions are mostly milk, cocoa, or a nourishing, easily-digested soup. At the very first the Commission gathered into dairies all the cows it could secure. These cows are fed with corn from the Argentine and bran from American wheat which has been milled in Belgian mills. As their milk is not sufficient, condensed milk is used as well. The address of the household and the name of all the members are given on every card. Any card giving false statements is at once withdrawn.

The principal food other than the bread is soup. The committee on soups includes senators, aldermen, burgomasters, the president of the restaurateurs, etc. A professor of the normal school has charge of general accounts; a manufacturer is responsible for everything connected with flour and bread; a restaurateur with the preparation of soup. Another department has only to do with soup ingredients. Another buys the vegetables from the farms. The potato and onion committee is separate, as is also that which has to do with the purchase of meat. In order to save feeding cattle and hogs the meat is being killed off rapidly.

In Brussels soup is prepared in central kitchens and is sent, under the seals of the Commission, to twenty-six distributing stations. Dance halls, schools, municipal buildings, etc., are used as stations at the noon hour. A large circular building until the war a rink or riding-school, has been turned into a kitchen large enough to cook daily for 58,000 persons. The tan bark has been exchanged for cobble stones, so it is possible to keep feet dry in spite of the moisture. Around the huge room is a circle of copper boilers; in the center men work and wagons drive in and out to distribute food stuffs and take away the cans of soup. In the small rooms close to the wall of the building, evidently used in the past for stalls, vegetables are prepared and meat cut up. In this one kitchen it takes seventy-two women to peel potatoes. All meat is cooked upon its arrival to avoid possibility of decay. The bouillon is later used for stock, and the cooked meat is chopped fine and is dis-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tributed to each boiler whenever it is needed.

Work in the kitchens begins at 2 A.M., and at that hour the gas-fitters light the fires under the boilers, which are filled with water by means of a hose. Two sets of cooks and carvers arrive at this same early hour. Every receipt for soup has been carefully worked out by the best trained dietitian; even the best way to peel potatoes was studied scientifically. There is a head cook who directs and distributes food stuffs to the soupmakers. These soupmakers are the best chefs from the hotels; each is responsible for an allotted number of boilers.

At seven in the morning the first boilers of soup are ready, and the work of filling the distributing cans begins. Immediately over the same fires the second boilers are prepared. It costs $700 to make one day's soup in one kitchen, and it takes thirty-two cooks and thirty-two assistant cooks, besides the women who prepare vegetables.

Each person standing in line at the distributing station brings a pitcher, a saucepan, an old coffee-pot—any receptacle that can be used to carry the soup away. Unlike most bread lines, it reveals no look of shame on the faces of the men and women. There is always sadness but there is no look of humiliation, as one after another has his ticket punched and receives his portion. Those who help are most gracious, addressing each recipient as "Monsieur," or "Madame." The people pass out in that silent manner that one becomes so used to in Belgium. Every distributing station is carried on by volunteer labor, and each service committee can regulate the work according to its own ideas.

The news that an agreement has been reached between Mr. Hoover and General von Bissing, Military Governor of Belgium, allowing the present wheat and rye crops to go to the civil population, is a matter of congratulation. The Belgians had been supplied with the seed and it has been the hope that the crops might be kept by Belgians. When one realizes that even in times of peace Belgium imports four-fifths of its grain, and that many people who had means at the beginning of the war are now without money, it will be seen that the work is by no means over.

Lacemaking Revived

The revival of the lacemaking industry by the central committee has done much to save women from the free bread line. Forty thousand women workers, many of them past middle life, carried on a trade in lacemaking before the war that amounted to $2,400,000 a year. These women are largely from the country districts and know no other trade. For generations the members of the family have been lacemakers. The new Belgian lace which has been collected and sent to London and America is sold for the people, and every dollar from every piece sold goes back to the women to enable them to pay for bread and soup. Pieces of lace made since October, 1914, have woven in with fine thread, "C. R. B.," and it is believed that these initials (Commission for Relief in Belgium) will be worth much in the generations to come. It is said that work has been found for more than half of the forty thousand lacemakers of Belgium.

Many of the old Belgian families had in their possession rare lace, some of it dating back to 1600, including wedding veils, flounces, shawls, etc. Hundreds of these pieces, many worth thousands of dollars, have been purchased by the Commission, enough to fill a museum; and they are now in America. The duty alone was over $60,000. Money derived from the sale of this lace to the Commission cannot be put aside as capital by the Belgian recipients, but must be used to employ labor.

Many persons are given the opportunity to make clothing. Hundreds of thousands of bales of cloth fill a large circus building in Brussels. From this center, in exactly the same way that the soup is sent out, the cloth is delivered to distributing centers. In one center I visited were a hundred cutters at work in a house which a few months ago was a beautiful residence on a fashionable street. On the top floor the heavy cutting was done by men; on the floor below women added the lining; on another floor girls put in buttons, tape and other findings. Sheets were torn and made ready to hem, and each piece of sewing was tied into a bundle ready to be carried away. On the lower floor, in a great room that must have been used as the reception room, still with its beautiful wall covering and hardwood floor, the people stood in long lines waiting for work. In the same way that the bakers were limited in their baking, every woman was limited as to the amount she might earn a week. She could carry away not more than two or three or four bundles, and every Wednesday she came back with the finished garments and was paid. These clothes go all over Belgium, to be sold or given away.

To Help Stay Home

What can we do to help in this great work? I asked that question over and over again and received always the same answer: "Stay away from Belgium, and make others stay away." It is a new game they are playing; the rules are strange and hard to learn. Those who come to look on or to help for a little while inevitably do one of two things: they get in trouble themselves, and someone has to stop his work to help them out, or they get the Commission into trouble. It takes months, not weeks, to learn what neutrality means in Belgium.

MABEL HYDE KITTREDGE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED